



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

43rd PARLIAMENT, 2nd SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 150 No. 122
Monday, June 21, 2021

Speaker: The Honourable Anthony Rota



CONTENTS

(Table of Contents appears at back of this issue.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, June 21, 2021

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayer

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

• (1105)

[*Translation*]

GREENHOUSE GAS POLLUTION PRICING ACT

The House resumed from June 2 consideration of the motion that Bill C-206, An Act to amend the Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act (qualifying farming fuel), be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Francis Drouin (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise virtually in the House today to speak to Bill C-206.

I would like to thank my colleague, the member for Northumberland—Peterborough South. I am sure he has had many discussions with farmers.

I also want to thank Michel Dignard and Réjean Pomainville, two farmers from my region I greatly respect and who informed me of the impact that the changes could have on farms. I am very grateful to them.

Personally, I supported the bill because I made a commitment to those two farmers. I want to thank them. They did the right thing by telling me about the potential repercussions this could have on farming.

The bill seeks an exemption to the price on pollution. There are computerized grain dryers, but they are still rather rare in Canada. Most farmers have to use propane dryers, and those who are lucky enough to have a natural gas connection can use a natural gas dryer.

Given that the price of the carbon tax will increase to \$170 by 2030, we hope that new technologies will be available on the market by then. I am sure that our government will present potential solutions and that it will invest to enable our farmers to take advantage of those solutions, which must, of course, be market solutions.

Climate change is real. For example, we know that the oil and transportation sectors account for approximately 52% of greenhouse gases produced in Canada, the heavy industries account for about 10%, and the agricultural sector accounts for roughly 10% as well.

We are trying to reduce the effects of climate change in the agricultural sector. The goal is not to penalize our farmers but to decarbonize their suppliers.

I supported Bill C-206, and I also support the objectives and changes that our government presented.

[*English*]

The rebate program for farmers, which will allocate an estimated \$100 million to the four provincial jurisdictions that have decided not to put a price on pollution, is a recognition by our government that we have to decarbonize the way we dry grain. However, right now those technologies may not be available to the majority of farmers. Obviously, by 2030 the price on pollution will rise to \$170 a tonne, which sends a market signal to those who create new technologies to adapt technology so that it is not necessarily carbon heavy. That is where I believe we need to go. It is the only way to decarbonize our economy.

We know the ag sector contributes 10% of our greenhouse gases. However, I know that farmers have done a tremendous job, such as our egg farmers, who are able to produce more than 50% of what they used to 50 years ago while reducing their carbon emissions by 50%. There are positive stories out there. Farmers have adopted new technologies, whether they are biodigesters, solar panels or those to make their dairy barns extremely energy efficient. They are doing a fantastic job. What we are trying to do now is decarbonize the majority of their suppliers.

I was happy to hear that there is now a \$200-million fund to help with the adoption of cover crops. I think that is an extremely important domain of science. If we could reward farmers so that cover crops play an even bigger role in capturing carbon, it would be an extremely good news story. The world will be looking at our net-zero products, and whether it is our produce or the other things that farmers grow, farmers will always be there. However, I think cover crops have a major role to play. I have started seeing farmers adopt it in my riding. Not everyone is, but some surely are, and the \$200-million fund that was presented in budget 2021 will be there to help and guide them.

Private Members' Business

Last week, the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food launched the agricultural clean technology program, which has a fund of \$165 million. There will be some money there to help farmers improve their green energy and energy efficiency, and help them further adopt precision agriculture. When we think about precision agriculture, we know there used to be days when farmers would just lay fertilizer across the land. Nowadays they can actually pinpoint, to the plant and to the row, where they need to put fertilizer, should they need it, to help improve plant health. That is the way of the future. The fertilizer industry has a role to play, and it is stepping up to play that particular role. Soil health is another important conversation we need to have in this country, and I think farmers want to be part of this particular conversation.

To get back to the matter at hand, as I said at the beginning of my speech, I have supported Bill C-206 because of a simple commitment that I made to two farmers back home. I certainly do not support an exemption that would last forever, but I do know that technologies will be available to our farmers. With the funds that were announced through budget 2021, there will be some dollars to help farmers adopt new technologies on the farm.

Grain drying is something that I will be looking at in my riding to see who has the most efficient method. It is part of my summer pet project to visit farms once it is safe to do so. It will help me better understand where farmers could make changes and where they might not necessarily have to rely on traditional technologies.

• (1110)

[*Translation*]

I want to raise another issue. Earlier we talked about cover crops and our government's \$200 million fund for cover crops. There are a lot of trees on our farmland, and deforestation of private lands is a major problem.

I am not trying to single out farmers, because I know they are doing what they have to do to earn an income and support their families. However, part of that \$200 million our government announced is for a reverse auction program, which is a really interesting initiative that encourages farmers to conserve existing wetlands and trees on their private property to capture carbon. These are all measures we announced in budget 2021 to help farmers reduce on-farm greenhouse gas emissions. This is an important thing to do because that is where the industry is heading.

I think we would be sending a wonderful message to the rest of the world if we could produce food while having a positive impact on the environment and limiting our greenhouse gas production. We would be the envy of the world, and I think that is how Canada should position itself.

Again, I thank my colleague from Northumberland—Peterborough South for his bill, which I support. I wish him luck. Even though this bill will not help the green transition, it is an important part of the conversation.

Ms. Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise again to speak to Bill C-206 today, as I did at second reading. Today, we have come full circle. I propose that we look at the bill by asking five basic questions, which we should ask

more often in these cases: who, when, how, what and where. It is very simple.

I will start with who, in other words, those we are proposing this bill for. Unlike other political parties, we in the Bloc Québécois do not tend to give gifts to people who do not need it.

Farmers kept the agriculture sector going in a crisis, which is not easy. We know that farm owners had a very tough time on the labour front. This hurt food security, supply and, in some cases, animal health. Management of issues surrounding the arrival of foreign workers has been problematic, and, a few days ago, assistance from the government in support of quarantine was cut in half.

However, even before the crisis began, our farmers were already struggling. Climate change is causing even greater uncertainty around crops and harvests. Furthermore, it is getting harder and harder to find young farmers to take over, particularly because the price of land keeps going up year after year.

People who grew up on the land and worked with their parents will find it increasingly difficult to take over the farming operation. There are rare occasions when parents can afford to be generous and gift the farm to their children, instead of using the value of the farm business they have built up their entire lives to fund their retirement. In other cases, given the rising cost of land and quotas, it is hard to find young farmers to take over.

Why are we doing this, that is, why are we debating Bill C-206? We must remember that the bill would amend the Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act, including section three, which lists the products that are not taxed, in particular those for farming purposes. Natural gas and propane were missing from the list of exempt products. Why does Bill C-206 seek to add them to section three?

A carbon tax discourages people from taking a certain action and encourages them to choose a behaviour over another. However, in order for that to happen, people must have options, and that is exactly the problem.

There was an example of this in my riding during the rail crisis. CN just stopped delivering propane for two weeks when farmers had to dry their crops, which was a critical time for them. The moisture level in crops was very high that year, and had farmers not been able to dry them, they would have rotted, which would have resulted in the loss of an entire year's income.

In this particular case, propane was the only option, since any alternatives are still in the pilot-project stage and are not a viable option for large-scale farming businesses. When I asked farmers, who were worried about not getting the propane they needed, they told me that there was no alternative to propane, but that they would like to have one.

Private Members' Business

The existing power grid would not even have the capacity to generate enough heat for drying grain. It is as though people expected to one day have electric hot air balloons—they are very popular back home—but this is not going to happen overnight. Technologies like biomass are still too new, and there is not enough incentive for us to expect quick changes in carbon pricing.

That brings me to my third point: When will it happen? This is the part I find unfortunate, because we are three days out from the end of the parliamentary session and the summer recess. This Parliament could end up being replaced with a new one, based on the election rumours we are hearing.

It is really unfortunate that we are debating a bill this important and necessary at the eleventh hour, knowing that it could end up dying on the Order Paper, just like Bill C-216, the bill on supply management introduced by my colleague from Berthier—Maskinongé, or the bill on farm succession planning, which the Senate just started studying.

• (1115)

On this third point, I want to say how disappointed we are with the government's management of the legislative calendar, because we are currently debating a great bill that, unfortunately, may never see the light of day.

How is Bill C-206 being dealt with?

This part is a bit nicer. As I was preparing for my speech on my drive in to work this morning from my riding of Saint-Jean, I listened again to what happened and what my other colleagues said, particularly those who are members of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food. I was very happy to hear how well people are working together on this committee. There is no excessive partisanship since everyone is serving the same cause, that of farmers and those who feed us. It is in that spirit of co-operation that a key amendment was proposed to improve Bill C-206. This amendment is really worthwhile, because it addresses the concern that some might have about the fact that there is a gap in the bill, the ultimate purpose of which is to try to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

The amendment sets an end date for the exemption for natural gas and propane. In other words, natural gas and propane will be exempt from taxation for 10 years in the hope that, a decade from now, there will be new technology that will enable us to stop using natural gas and propane. That is our hope, anyway, but the government needs to get cracking because farmers do not want to be passive witnesses to these changes. They want to be part of it, but they need help. Contrary to what some people think, farmers do not wake up in the morning thinking about how great it is that they can go out and pollute. They just want help finding alternatives that are commercially viable, because they operate in a global market and cannot pass costs on to their customers. They would no longer be able to compete internationally, so we have to give our farmers that support.

The final point is, where is that supposed to happen? People might think that it is obvious it should be done in the House of Commons and Parliament, because that is where bills are passed

and amendments made. That seems obvious, but nowadays, very few things that should be obvious are.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank everyone who contributed to the parliamentary spirit that has characterized Parliament during the pandemic. I would like to take a few moments to pay tribute to the interpreters, the support staff and the tech support who made it possible for us to function relatively normally, despite COVID-19.

I also want to express my hope that, despite everything, we will get back to normal quickly, so that we can have accountability, so that there is someone in the House who answers questions, and so that reporters can do their job and ask parliamentarians questions as they leave the House. I also hope that we can go back to normal sooner rather than later so we can get parliamentarians working cooperatively, apart from the occasional stormy question period.

When we parliamentarians are working together face to face, we are able to move files along more efficiently, understand one another better, and remember for whom, why, how, where and when we create bills. It is fundamental to remember that, and that is what we are reminded of when we sit in the House in person.

With that in mind, I want to acknowledge the work of the House, but I also want to take a moment to remember the farmers. I wish Bill C-206 could have gone forward. I cannot help but think of all the people I have known since I was a little girl growing up in the country. As members can imagine, it has been quite a while since I was “little”.

My thoughts are with our farmers, in the hope that, if not this time, Bill C-206 can come back sooner rather than later and eventually be passed by the House and the Senate.

• (1120)

[*English*]

Mr. Matthew Green (Hamilton Centre, NDP): Madam Speaker, I have had many occasions to rise with privilege to share a bit about my own family history. I have spoken a lot about my father and the African Canadian diaspora, but I have not had the privilege of speaking about my mother's side of the family, a family that settled not far from here, about an hour from here in the South Mountain area. It is a place I have fond memories of, stories of my grandfather with a grade-six education being told by his father that the world and the road ahead is as long as he can make it.

My grandfather, Nelson Scharf, in fact had a cheese factory in Russell and Hulburt. It was a connection we had to the supply chain and the agricultural sector here. My grandmother, Doris Forward, had a family farm in Chesterville. My cousin, Tom Forward, is still on the land and works within the dairy sector today.

Private Members' Business

I think about those early memories of visiting those farms, visiting the cheese factory, being up close as a child and seeing these hard-working people, folks who often do not get enough credit for the number of hours they work and for what they provide this country.

I rise today with the honour, on our 60-year anniversary as New Democrats, of being from the founding party of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, which aimed to alleviate the suffering that workers and farmers felt and endured under capitalism. We are, in fact, the only party that was founded by farmers, so it is an honour and a privilege to be here today with that family background and that party background in support of this bill.

I want to take a moment and thank the hon. member for Northumberland—Peterborough South, a gentleman whom I have gotten to know in my committee work and somebody who I know has brought with him the good intentions of supporting the constituents within his riding.

For those who are tuning in and trying to get a sense of what this is all about, this bill, Bill C-206, seeks to amend the definition of “qualifying farming fuel” in the Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act to include natural gas and propane. Of course, this issue is complex. I will not pretend to be an expert, and there is certainly a lot of room for improvement at the committee stage, but this legislation stems from an unseasonably wet autumn in 2019, which was called “the harvest from hell”, when grain farmers were using propane and natural gas heaters to dry their grain. Without these grain dryers, grain rots and becomes worthless as food or as a cash crop contributing to our GDP.

There is currently no viable alternative to the use of propane or natural gas for the operation of these dryers, and because propane and natural gas are currently not covered under the act qualifying for farm fuels, grain farmers are forced into a situation of contributing more CO₂ into the atmosphere as a result of carbon taxes on the cleaner fuels. The Grain Growers of Canada has confirmed, as of February of last year, that many of them have turned to higher-CO₂-emitting diesel fuel, which is listed, ironically, as qualifying farm fuel in the act, for grain dryers to avoid the higher-taxed propane or natural gas heaters.

As our very learned critic for agriculture, the hon. member for Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, has stated, ultimately what we want is high-CO₂-emitting industries to be contributing less carbon dioxide into the atmosphere, and if we penalize the agricultural sector with a higher price for choosing a cleaner fuel option, we are running entirely counter to our ultimate objective of combatting climate change by reducing GHG emissions. Our critic for agriculture, the hon. member for Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, states quite rightly that farmers are not only well aware of what the effects of climate change will be, but they are also one of our greatest tools for fighting climate change.

When we are looking at this bill, I think we have heard this false dichotomy between Liberals and Conservatives about carbon taxes being the defining feature of climate change. The Liberals would suggest this is a market solution and Conservatives would suggest this is yet another tax. As New Democrats, we recognize that reducing greenhouse gas emissions ought to be our objective, and we

do not feel that providing this in this particular way meets that objective. While the intent of the bill is sound, making it easier and more affordable for farmers to burn cleaner fuel should be a no-brainer, and using no fuels whatsoever or existing clean technologies is just not a viable option.

• (1125)

I think of my family who are still in this sector. My cousins, the Weagants, sold farm equipment throughout Ontario. I also think about the hard-working farmers in my city. I am a very proud MP representing Hamilton Centre, and many people do not know that while we have close to 600,000 people, the geography of our city encapsulates a very large portion of rural areas in the greenbelt and into some of the tender fruits land.

We are here today hoping to see a better outcome on this particular issue, to ensure that we are not adding to the complexities of the food supply chain and that we are cutting through the noise into a bit of a more intelligent argument about, again, a party founded by the CCF and about supporting our farm workers. Those who are out there across Ontario, Quebec and, indeed, across the country know that the New Democratic Party was founded on those principles.

The Regina Manifesto, right there in our founding documents, says, “The security of tenure for the farmer upon his farm which is imperilled by the present disastrous situation of the whole industry, together with adequate social insurance, ought to be guaranteed under equitable conditions.” It is right there, in the foundation of the CCF, which, 60 years later, would become the NDP of today.

I hold that position, and I support our agricultural sector. I know that farmers are on the front lines of climate change, and I know that they will play a key role in our food security and our ability to adequately adapt to the changing climate, which will have a direct impact first on them, and of course, in the spirit of the hard-working people of my own family, those who continue to this day to work the land and to acknowledge our precious connection to the land, the food that we have and the food supply chains.

In closing, I would like to thank the hon. member for Cowichan—Malahat—Langford who, on the technical aspects of this, has been absolutely incredible for me and our caucus to help us better understand the nuances, because we want to see a just recovery. We want to see a just transition for workers. We acknowledge that farmers are indeed some of the hardest-working people, and that includes the migrant workers who work alongside them in our fields.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the members of the House for allowing me to rise with the deep privilege that I have in the waning days of this Parliament to be able to share a little about myself, my family and our ongoing support for workers as New Democrats.

● (1130)

Mrs. Karen Vecchio (Elgin—Middlesex—London, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is a wonderful Monday morning. After listening to the earlier speeches, I would like to offer my thanks. My thanks to the Liberal Party member, who I just heard speak about the importance of this bill. Then there was my friend from Saint-Jean, and I did not know that she grew up on a farm, so we have a few more things in common. My thanks as well to the member for Hamilton Centre.

This is something that we have to recognize, as it is so important to our farmers. They are the ones who produce our food. They are the ones who, throughout this entire pandemic, have been working to support Canadians. Looking at this bill, I think it is absolutely exceptional.

I would really like to thank my great friend, the member for Northumberland—Peterborough South. I actually drove through parts of his riding yesterday on my return to Ottawa from Elgin—Middlesex—London. The one thing I see in southwestern Ontario is beautiful agricultural land. There are lots of different commodities and sectors, but it is a big farming community. There are some big pockets of cities, but surrounding all of those big cities are acres and acres of great farmland where they are producing necessary commodities and food.

I am going to start with a very simple quote, which actually comes from the member for Northumberland—Peterborough South. He said this at committee, and I want to put it in the record of the House of Commons because this is a very valuable debate.

These are things that are very, very important to my riding, so I appreciate having the opportunity to speak to this bill for the farmers who are living in Elgin—Middlesex—London. I can tell members that, according to Statistics Canada, in 2016 there were 1,930 farm operators in Elgin and 3,260 farm operators in the county of Middlesex. These are things that are very, very important to my riding, so having the opportunity to speak to this bill is an honour.

To quote my good friend, at the agriculture committee he said:

The greenhouse gas pollution pricing currently allows qualifying farmers an exemption on certain farm fuels such as gasoline and diesel; however, it fails to extend that exemption to other fuels such as natural gas and propane. This is challenging on many different fronts, as farmers quite often don't have other options and their only option for their particular industrial equipment may be natural gas and propane.

The science says that natural gas and propane are often cleaner fuels than diesel or gasoline. Why would we not include them in this exemption? Farmers, after all, are stewards of our land and, along with our indigenous people, were some of the first environmentalists standing up for the land and also for the animals and plants located on their properties.

That is why I wanted to talk about propane. I have quite a bias, to be honest. The former chair of the Canadian Propane Association is a resident of Elgin—Middlesex—London. He is also the CFO for Dowler-Karn, which is probably one of the biggest distributors of gasoline and fuel products to multiple farmers in the southwestern

Private Members' Business

Ontario region. I can sit down with him, and when I call Dan Kelly with a question, he will answer. If he does not have the answer, he will find it, because he is out there working for Canadian farmers.

He brought this to my attention as well. He said that Bill C-206 is excellent and what we need to do. He was actually hoping that we would not have to put through Bill C-206, and that the Liberal government may recognize the issue and put it in the budget, but we did not see that. The government does not recognize that it is going to take more than just two or three years for farmers to transition to greener fuels.

I was really happy to see this bill continuing on to third reading, but as the member for Saint-Jean indicated, these are the final days, so I hope that today we can get through this. After we return to Parliament, hopefully this is a bill that the Senate will look at very quickly. This is what our farmers need and what they are asking for.

Continuing on to the Canadian Propane Association, I would like to read a statement I received from it. I am sure everybody has received it as well. It explains why we should support this bill and the importance of the exemption that would come to our farm operators.

This statement, I believe, was put out after the vote on second reading of Bill C-206, a vote of 177-145. All opposition parties actually agreed and recognized that this is something that needs to be done. We saw that the Liberal government was not good with that, yet it may have had to do with it coming from an awesome Conservative. We may never know. However, I will read out the Canadian Propane Association's statement, which says:

"Discouraging the increased use of carbon-intense fuels such as gas and diesel in favour of low-emission energy like propane for agriculture applications would be a win-win for the environment and for farmers' bottom line," said Nathalie St-Pierre, President of the Canadian Propane Association....

● (1135)

"The principle of the GGPPA is intended to encourage a reduction in the use of carbon-intense fuels," said St-Pierre. "By exempting gas and diesel but not allowing the same exemption for propane, the law actually encourages the increased use of gas and diesel – this is environmental nonsense."

Just moments ago, we heard my friend from Hamilton Centre say the exact same thing, which is that, because of this, people are beginning to use diesel. The government has established the carbon tax, but it is actually giving an exemption to a dirtier fuel. We have an option here. The statement continues:

St-Pierre said that CPA members are also hearing from their customers in the agriculture sector about the significant added cost due to the federal carbon tax. According to an estimate provided by the Parliamentary Budget Officer last December, over the next five years about \$235 million will be collected from farmers for using natural gas and propane.

I will note that statistic. I was speaking to Dan about this. On behalf of the farmers in our area, he sent a cheque for over \$1 million for just a few months for carbon tax collection. That \$1 million that could have been used for so many other things, perhaps new technology, workers or new things on farms, but instead, that money is paid to the government.

Private Members' Business

We are talking about \$235 million. I have heard people say that the government is going to lose \$235 million. To me, the government should not be taking that \$235 million in the first place, so it would not be losing revenue. This is revenue it should not be taking, so we have to look at this as not being a loss of revenue for the government.

The government had no business taking the \$235 million in the first place because, at the end of the day, who pays for it? It is going to be the farmers. After the farmers, who pays for it? It is going to be people sitting at their tables, eating their cornflakes or their eggs from the local chicken farm. These are the people who, at the end of the day, are going to be impacted.

Yes, this bill is good for farmers, but it is also good for Canadian consumers who want to support the agricultural industry in Canada, especially that in Elgin—Middlesex—London, which is so important to me.

We have talked about inflation. In the last few weeks, inflation has been really key. We have talked about how much the price of wood and lumber have gone up. Housing is a big issue. In my riding of Elgin—Middlesex—London, there has been a 46% increase since last April in the cost of a two-storey home. Inflation is an issue, and the government is adding more costs to our goods.

If we talk about poverty reduction strategies, we need to see what we are doing that is creating more barriers. I look at not giving this exemption as just another barrier to reducing the high cost of our goods right now. Farmers know that, when they are paying all this money, it affects their bottom line.

I am so fortunate to work with Scott at the Grain Farmers of Ontario in my area. He is the zone manager there. I thank Scott, who always works with me. The Grain Farmers of Ontario is the province's largest commodity organization, representing over 28,000 barley, corn, oats, soybean and wheat farmers, and it has been very supportive of Bill C-206, an act to amend the Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act regarding qualifying farming fuel.

The Grain Farmers of Ontario is supporting this bill because of its exemption of the carbon tax for on-farm fuel and calls on all MPs to consider the tax on grain drying and its impact on the agriculture system in Canada. It is quite simple. The government should not be making money off a tax that negatively impacts a farmer's ability to market viable grain. The carbon tax does not make that happen.

Brendan Byrne was the chair of the Grain Farmers of Ontario on February 22, 2021. There are a lot of AGMs going on, so that may not be his position now.

As we have always indicated, farmers have been doing great work in our communities. They are the stewards of our land. I think of some of the great projects that have been done in the back of farmers' fields with wetlands conservation. Those settlements are being taken back.

I love farmers, so I am very supportive of Bill C-206, and I thank the member for Northumberland—Peterborough South for bringing this bill forward.

• (1140)

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is great to be back in the House. It is great to have a vast audience across the way to hear what I am about to say, although the member for Kingston and the Islands may not entirely agree with it.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this excellent private member's bill, Bill C-206, from my colleague for Northumberland—Peterborough South, and in particular to talk about the significant failures in environmental policy on the part of government and how it is imposing costs on Canadians without a real plan to help us achieve our environmental objectives vis-à-vis climate change.

I will start briefly by congratulating the member for Northumberland—Peterborough South on his excellent work on this bill and so many other issues. He serves as the shadow minister for revenue in our caucus. When I hear “shadow minister of revenue”, I think it sounds exciting, but he really has grabbed this position by the horns. It has been a pleasure to work with him on a number of revenue issues, including trying to bring about reforms to the direction and control system.

This member has been a great champion of the charitable sector, trying to push the government to reform various aspects of the regulatory and legislative environment around revenue, especially direction and control, to really empower our charitable organizations and help them move forward. I want to congratulate the member for all his work, particularly in this bill, on behalf of farmers in his riding and elsewhere.

Bill C-206 seeks to change the definition of a qualifying farm fuel to include certain fuels not currently included, and that is a step forward in terms of allowing any fuel a farmer would use to be qualified as a qualifying farm fuel, and therefore not having the carbon tax applied to it. Right now, while natural gas and propane are not identified as qualifying farm fuels, gas and diesel are. Not only does this impose additional costs on farmers, but it also gives farmers an incentive to move away from using natural gas and propane and toward using relatively more gas and diesel.

In all likelihood, this is sort of perverse incentive that encourages greater greenhouse gas emissions, so this member is rationalizing the system through this bill in a way that would reduce costs for farmers and help our environment by removing this artificial incentive to use fuels that pollute to a greater extent.

One would think this is a no-brainer on that basis. If this is going to reduce costs for farmers, but is also going to help our environment by providing more of an incentive for farmers to use cleaner fuels, why would it not just be automatic that everyone in this House supports it? The Liberals are stubbornly clinging to their position that the way they did it was fine.

The big problem with these Liberals on so many aspects of their environmental policy is they do not understand the way in which perverse incentives can lead to worse outcomes for the environment, and they are not willing to look critically at the impact of those incentives on behaviour.

One of the issues we have talked about a lot in the Conservative caucus in terms of the failures of the Liberals' environmental policy is this issue of border adjustments. The Liberal approach is to impose carbon taxes on Canadian producers, Canadian farmers and Canadian consumers, but not to apply those same requirements on people outside of Canada who are producing products and then selling those products in the Canadian market.

The effect of this is that it is artificially creating an advantage for foreign producers, the people manufacturing goods and growing crops outside the country who are trying to then sell those products in Canada. One is creating an advantage for those outside Canada who are selling their products to Canada over Canadian producers. This obviously does not make any sense, in terms not only of protecting our own economic interests, but also of responding to the environmental challenges we face.

When one makes it more expensive, and in the case of this particular bill, it relates to farming, and when one imposes more costs on Canadian farmers and therefore tilts the field against our farmers and in favour of people involved in agriculture production outside of the country, that is not helping the environment. It is simply hurting our own economy at no environmental benefit.

• (1145)

We understand, in this caucus, that the challenges we face in terms of climate change are global challenges. Canada has to do its part, but it also has to put in place policies that recognize that emissions can happen outside of the country, and when they happen they impact us. We need to have a structure that integrates an appreciation for the global impact of climate change.

That is why the Conservative environmental plan, for the first time from any party, proposes a strong policy around border adjustment tariffs. There has to be an equivalency between the burden imposed on Canadian producers and the import adjustments that are taking place. We should not be creating a tilted playing field in which we are actually creating an advantage for those producing greenhouse gas emissions outside of the country.

We have raised this issue of perverse incentives: incentives in the policy that actually encourage the wrong kind of behaviour. In the case of border adjustments, we are talking about an incentive that the government has created, in its approach to environmental policy, to move production outside of the country.

If someone is making products for the Canadian market right now in Canada, that person is paying carbon tax. If someone is producing those products outside of Canada in a jurisdiction that does not have a carbon tax and then selling them into Canada, they are in an economically advantageous position, at least vis-à-vis the carbon tax.

This should be fixed so that we have a fair environmental policy that encourages improvements to environmental performance, but

Private Members' Business

does not encourage the wrong kinds of adaptation, such as moving work outside of the country. As other colleagues have talked about as well, in the case of this bill we are talking about another case of perverse incentive. In imposing the carbon tax on certain kinds of fuel and not others, as the system is currently structured, there is an incentive for farmers to use fuels that may be more expensive and that may produce more in the way of emissions.

I think we can do better. The member for Northumberland—Peterborough South has quite rightly seen the opportunity to do better and has thus put forward a bill that seeks to adjust the incentive environment. That is why I am very supportive of this bill. I would encourage all members to be supportive of it and to push the government to recognize something. It has been a talking point of the Liberals for a long time. They say the environment and the economy go hand in hand, yet they impose restrictions and taxes that hurt our economy and provide no benefit to the environment.

It does not make any sense that they would impose obligations on Canadian producers and not have the corresponding adjustments happening at the border. It does not make any sense from an environmental standpoint. If they really believed that there was a unity of objective that could be pursued between the environment and the economy, they would be supportive of the plan that we have put forward, which includes these kinds of border adjustment measures.

In general, in our environmental plan as announced by our leader, the money that is gathered through the deductions paid when people purchase products that emit carbon is put back into their pockets to also pay for adaptation. Our plan is not just about taking money away from people who are producing; it is about giving those resources back to them to invest in adaptations that improve their environmental performance. Our plan is very different from what we see from the Liberal government. The government is trying to use the environment often as a way to raise extra revenue. Our approach is to target measures that are going to improve the environment, while also supporting our industry.

On this side of the House, we recognize the important role of our farmers. We recognize the value of having agricultural production in Canada. We want to strengthen farming communities. We recognize that from a basic security, food security and well-being perspective, it is important to have strong agricultural production happening here in Canada.

We have championed this position, as a party, from the very beginning. We understand that it is not enough to just say it. Within every party we hear members saying flowery words about the agricultural sector, but the Conservative Party has always been there to stand with our farmers, and Bill C-206 is another example of that.

Private Members' Business

• (1150)

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is certainly an honour to rise on behalf of the good people of Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola to speak to my colleagues about Bill C-206, brought by the MP for Northumberland—Peterborough South, who has done an excellent job of finding an issue that resonates not just within his riding but right across the country. I will make a few short points about this, because I believe that Private Members' Business provides the opportunity for members, such as the member for Northumberland—Peterborough South, to bring up issues they are hearing locally to see if they are salient. The adoption of this bill through second reading to committee and now to third reading shows there is a consensus in this country. The Liberals were the only party to vote against it. Every other party recognizes that Canada's future is, in great part, due to agriculture. Many may argue that Canada's past was formulated on that, and I would say that is true, but so is the fact we can do more.

In fact, in the majority government the current ambassador to China, Dominic Barton, put forward the Barton report and said that Canada could do so much more by working with agriculture. It could expand exports and feed people not just across our country but around the globe. It seemed for a while that the report might go somewhere. Most farmers thought it was great to have a government that was focused on that. Unfortunately, the government was not. Rather, it was focused simply on ideology and not on helping to connect the dots to make it work for farmers.

As the MP who sponsored the legislation said, the Grain Farmers of Ontario stated, “there are no readily available grain drying technology replacement alternatives that are cost effective. Drying grain is essential for marketing grain.” This points out that when the input costs are too high, grain farmers will lose traction to other areas that have better prices. Unfortunately, it is a commodity market and we cannot just say, “Buy Canadian because Canada is great.” People in other countries also need to feed their families. If the rate for our grain is too high because of input costs, these people will simply go to another cost provider.

The member of Parliament for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan previously mentioned the concept of carbon leakage, which is where adding extra regulations or taxation beyond that of another jurisdiction eventually makes it difficult for a place with a carbon tax, such as Canada's, to compete. I should know this. A B.C. Liberal government was the first to introduce a carbon tax in British Columbia. It found out quite quickly that the farming community would not be able to be competitive. Therefore, along with cement, it ended up having to subsidize many of those activities.

I am grateful the MP for Northumberland—Peterborough South has brought forward something that will help with that competitiveness. The bill has received broad agreement, with the exception of the Liberal government and its backbenchers. I am sure there was a whipped vote on this, so I know many Liberal members probably felt very sympathetic and wanted to vote alongside the Conservatives, the Bloc and the NDP to support our farmers, but unfortunately it seems many on that side do not question the government's position as much. In fact, some seem to want to carry it on all day long, but enough about the member for Kingston and the Islands.

I just have a few more things to say. The Conservatives believe we should be working with agriculture. The government has put out a clean fuel standard that is so complicated that farmers do not know what opportunities are there. They are worried about getting lost in the paperwork. It is the same government that is making it more difficult for farm operations to use small amounts of propane. The government is basically encouraging them, through red tape, to move to diesel. We know it is not as clean, as easy to store or as manageable. The current government seems to always be at odds with what farmers need and want.

I will say this. Members like the member for Northumberland—Peterborough South and our Conservative caucus will be standing up for our farmers. We will put forward solutions, and we will have a meaningful impact on our greenhouse gas emissions while growing the economy, especially for our farmers.

• (1155)

Mr. Philip Lawrence (Northumberland—Peterborough South, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is absolutely my pleasure to rise on my private member's bill, Bill C-206. To me, it is a fantastic wrap-up for the year, if we go to an election.

A couple of weeks into being an MP, I was in Ottawa and my staffer came to me and said, “You won the lottery”. I did not think I had bought a ticket. What did that mean? I had gotten number 16 on the private member's bills, which then put in place a large canvass of issues: ones that affect people across Canada and in my wonderful riding of Northumberland—Peterborough South. One issue that kept coming up was the impact of the Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act on the agricultural sector.

I am a very proud advocate for and supporter of the agriculture sector and rural Canada in general. I had been told that dirtier fuels like diesel and gasoline were exempt from the Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act but propane and natural gas were not, and of the impact this was having on our local farmers. When I had the opportunity, I was compelled. This was something I had to bring forward for the residents of Northumberland—Peterborough South and for our farmers across the country.

I have enjoyed this process. It has been an iterative process and it has been collaborative. In fact, this whole hour has been an island of its own in a sea of partisanship. This has been full of non-partisanship. We had the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell stand up for my private member's bill and for a commitment he made to a couple of constituents. That is the very epitome of what it is to be from rural Canada and rural Ontario. When we give our word in rural Ontario and in rural Canada, we stand by it. That is exactly what this member did, and I salute him.

Government Orders

One of the issues he brought to attention in his discussion was that things may change, and that very well may be. That is why the member for Cowichan—Malahat—Langford made a wise amendment to my private member's bill, which was to timeline it and have it go for only 10 years. If technology evolves and, in a decade, we can get to a point where there are biofuels or some other way, we are all for it, but as of now there is no other solution. Climate change is 100% real, and we are all in the House to fight climate change.

In the absence of exemption, we are pushing our farmers out of competitiveness because they are dependent on worldwide markets and on trade boards for pricing. When a cost is increased, such as with the carbon tax, it is put directly on the tables of our farmers. Farmers work so hard. Especially through this pandemic, they have not stopped for a moment, and because of that they have kept our food supply the best in the world. We produce the best grain, the best poultry and the best beef right here in Canada, and we need to make sure that our farmers stay competitive because when we increase input costs, those come directly from the farmers.

These costs not only affect our farmers, but entire rural communities because farmers are largely the ones who drive our economies. They are the ones who go to tractor dealerships and buy tractors. They are the ones who go to local restaurants, and there may be only a couple of restaurants in their towns. They are also the ones who support our local grocery stores, so we need to support and protect our farmers.

As I said, we are at the end of the session. I would like to take a moment to thank all the wonderful members of my constituency of Northumberland—Peterborough South and thank the farmers for this wonderful piece of legislation that I have been able to work with. Particularly, I would like to thank Brandon from the Grain Farmers. I would like to thank my staffer Hailey, who was fantastic and critical to doing this. Most important, I would like to thank all the members of the agriculture community who worked so hard to get this on board. We will have a vote on Wednesday and we will get this across. Hopefully, we will be back in session so we can get this bill passed and help our farmers.

I thank everyone out there so much. It has been a great pleasure to hear all the interventions. Some of my best friends, across the aisle and otherwise, have spoken. The member for Hamilton Centre is even wearing a blue suit for us, if I am allowed to acknowledge that he is in the chamber. I really appreciate that. I thank everyone for their learned interventions and their contributions. It is a great day for farmers.

• (1200)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): It being two minutes past noon, the time provided for debate has expired.

Accordingly, the question is on the motion.

[*Translation*]

If a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes to request a recorded division or that the motion be adopted on division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mr. Bernard Généreux: Madam Speaker, I am pleased to request a recorded division.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Pursuant to order made on Monday, January 25, the recorded division on the motion stands deferred until Wednesday, June 23, at the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2021, NO. 1

The House resumed from June 18 consideration of Bill C-30, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on April 19, 2021 and other measures, as reported (with amendments) from the committee, and of Motion No. 2.

Ms. Louise Chabot (Thérèse-De Blainville, BQ): Madam Speaker, thank you for giving me the opportunity to continue the speech I started on Friday.

Does Bill C-30, budget implementation act, 2021, no. 1, provide adequate guarantees to protect workers, to protect the unemployed, to protect sick workers and to treat seniors and their care workers with dignity? As I was saying, the answer is maybe or no.

I would like to use the five minutes I have remaining to talk about sick workers, who were counting on the government to take action after 50 years to extend special EI sickness benefits from 15 weeks to 50 weeks once and for all.

There is no reason for the government to pass up this opportunity, to ignore the testimony and to abandon 150,000 people who benefit every day from sickness benefits, which expire after 15 weeks.

The government decided to take a half step by increasing the benefits to 26 weeks starting in 2022. In the short term, sick workers will have no more than 15 weeks of benefits. We are making a heartfelt plea for the bill to be passed. We heard the evidence; the House of Commons adopted a motion; the bill sponsored by my colleague from Salaberry—Suroît was adopted by a majority; the Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities, of which I am the deputy chair, did a clause-by-clause study of the bill on June 17. All that is needed is one last push. We must act, and the government can do so by seeking royal assent. It must do so now.

Government Orders

Unemployed workers had very high expectations. I remind members that, in 2015, the Liberal government promised to overhaul the EI system, which leaves behind 60% of workers. They cannot access it because it discriminates against women, part-time workers, and workers who are ineligible and abandoned by the system.

It took the pandemic to force the government to implement temporary measures. Once again, all the budget offers is a single, 420-hour eligibility requirement for a period of one year. This is urgent. Where is the government? This is not enough. Once again, the government has everything it needs.

The Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities conducted a big study on modernizing employment insurance. The committee's report was tabled in the House last week. The government has everything it needs, it has the solutions and has access to all of the analyses on the flaws of the program. However, according to Bill C-30, there will be another two years of consultations.

I read an article from Radio-Canada in which the Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Disability Inclusion was saying that the computer system was in need of updates, that modernization could not happen all at once and that we might actually have to wait another seven years. That is preposterous.

It is unbelievable that the government is going to negate all of the efforts that have been made for so long and invest in consultations. The time for consultation is over. We need to sit down at the drawing board and take action. All of the solutions are in place. We need to do this for women, youth and self-employed workers.

● (1205)

Some might think that the crisis is over because there is a glimmer of hope. However, some sectors of the industry are still heavily impacted and still do not have any answers for their workers. They cannot provide any answers in the short term unless the government changes course and takes immediate action to undertake a reform.

We cannot wait any longer. I think that the government has everything it needs. Although some aspects might technically be more difficult because it is a complex system, the government needs to make them more politically desirable and implement a real employment insurance system. Workers are calling for it, as are groups representing unemployed workers and women.

We cannot continue with a system that discriminates against so many workers. I am thinking in particular about the many regions of Quebec and Canada that rely on seasonal industries. These workers experience gaps and become impoverished between their two employment periods. If we want to revitalize our regional economies, then we need to recognize the unique situation of seasonal economies and adapt the EI system accordingly so that workers in these industries are not penalized by default.

I would like to quote a witness who appeared before the Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities and send a message to the government. The witness said, "Just do it." It is time to act.

From what columnists are saying, we have probably reached the end of this Parliament. The government could very well trigger an

unnecessary election campaign. It will no doubt brag about everything it has done for workers, but we must not lose sight of the fact that the government has not taken any structured, concrete action, even though it has had the means to do so for quite some time now. It has made only empty promises, without any commitments.

Nothing will change as of tomorrow morning for workers who are sick. They will still be entitled to only 15 weeks of benefits, or possibly 26 weeks in 2022. We in the Bloc Québécois are calling on the government to increase sickness benefits to 50 weeks right now, but the government is still asking the unemployed to wait.

The government's Bill C-30 has many other shortcomings, including the fact that it discriminates against seniors. We asked that a study be done and evidence provided to justify discriminating against seniors between the ages of 65 and 74. Very little information was forthcoming. It is ridiculous—

● (1210)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Order. I apologize for interrupting the hon. member.

Ms. Louise Chabot: I am hopeful the government will rise in the House today to take concrete steps for all workers—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Questions and comments, the hon. parliamentary secretary.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, June 21 is National Indigenous Peoples Day, a day we can all reflect on the 215 children who matter, children who really do matter, and murdered and missing indigenous women and girls. It is very important for all of us to work toward reconciliation.

The budget implementation bill is a continuation of support programs that have been there to help Canadians get through this pandemic, whether one is a senior, a worker or a youth. These support programs were there to ensure that we would be in a better position to be able to recover in the pandemic, while at the same time providing disposable income for Canadians at a time in which they need it most.

Could the member provide her thoughts as to why it is important we actually pass this legislation?

[*Translation*]

Ms. Louise Chabot: Madam Speaker, in terms of the length of debate on the bill, that is up to us.

Government Orders

With regard to all the measures, the Bloc Québécois said it would support Bill C-30. Indeed, this bill does have measures that people need and that we need to implement.

However, I must remind the government that, whether it be the Canada emergency wage subsidy, the Canada emergency rent subsidy, EI, sickness benefits or measures for seniors, all these measures are temporary and will come to an end. The bill does not include any meaningful measures nor any vision.

We have been saying for a long time that, in order to find a way out of this crisis, we need a vision to help us look forward and propose real, concrete and meaningful measures that will be lasting, not just temporary.

[*English*]

Mr. Damien Kurek (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): Madam Speaker, I had the chance to listen to both the first part and second part of the hon. member's speech.

I have not heard very much about a part of the bill that proposes an amendment to the Canada Elections Act, which specifically would make it unlawful to knowingly mislead electors during an election campaign. I find it interesting that this is in an omnibus budget bill. Has she had a chance to look into the proposed amendment to the Canada Elections Act and does she have any comments on it?

• (1215)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Louise Chabot: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for the question, even though I cannot answer it entirely.

The entire election issue has us scratching our heads. Why make changes with respect to elections when everyone here is saying that there will not be an election during the pandemic and we are still in a pandemic?

I even wonder why there needs to be an election and why we should make changes. I hate the fact that we in the House are unable to reach a consensus on the conditions to put in place to hold an election. It is up to parliamentarians. This should not be done through a regulation in a bill.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, I really appreciated the speech by my colleague from Thérèse-De Blainville.

She talked about employment insurance and the fact that the current system is flawed. Many workers have suffered the consequences. She also talked about sick leave and the fact that the bill provides for only half the period that everyone considers necessary. People suffering from diseases such as cancer need sick leave for up to a year.

There are also cuts to the Canada emergency response benefit. Since the budget was tabled in House, we have been calling for an adjustment to allow people to continue to receive \$500 a week. It is important, especially during a pandemic.

According to my colleague, why is the government refusing to make these important changes?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Thérèse-De Blainville only has a few seconds to reply to the question.

Ms. Louise Chabot: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague. A very brief answer would be that the government has abandoned the idea that these programs are part of the social safety net. The government views them as an insurance policy. The time has come for the government to reconsider—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Resuming debate, the hon. member for Battle River—Crowfoot.

[*English*]

Mr. Damien Kurek (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is an honour to join in the debate, once again, in the House.

However, from what I am hearing in the media, and the rumours around Ottawa, we very well may be facing an election in the coming months. As this may be my last speech prior to that election, I want to share some brief words of thanks to the constituents of Battle River—Crowfoot for the honour to be their voice in Canada's Parliament over the last year and a half or so.

As we have faced an unprecedented time on so many fronts and the need for collaboration and to hold the government to account as a member of the opposition, it has been a true honour. I look forward to life getting back to normal. Alberta plans to open for the summer, with the vast majority of COVID restrictions being lifted on July 1. It is an exciting prospect for Albertans as we look forward to getting back to normal.

Even though Parliament is scheduled to rise in a few days, I look forward to continuing to fight in every way possible for the good people of east central Alberta and Battle River—Crowfoot for whom I have the honour and privilege of serving.

I am rising on debate on the Liberal's budget, an omnibus budget bill, Bill C-30, which the Liberals promised to never do. When a Liberal parliamentary secretary was asked that very question on Friday, he said in effect that this was different because it was a budget bill. I have asked a number of questions and on this and, quite frankly, I have not received much response to them. This bill covers a wide swath of things that, yes, were promised in the much-delayed budget that was introduced a number of months ago, but it also includes some other aspects, such as an amendment to the Canada Elections Act, a change to the gas tax fund and a few other things, which I will dive into in more detail.

However, I would like to address one concern I increasingly hear from constituents, and that is the attitude to which this current Liberal government has approached the legislative agenda and the way it has governed the country. I had a constituent give me a very apt description that I would like to share with members about the rhetoric that has been coming out of the Liberal benches as of late, and it is simply this.

Government Orders

The government is quick to blame the opposition for all its failures, which I think we have been very effective at articulating how absurd that is. Had it not been for the opposition, Canada would be in a much worse spot when it comes to COVID relief programs. The third time is the charm with respect to legislation that has had to be repaired several times. The fact is that the opposition has been exposing many of the areas of mismanagement and very troubling trends related to the approach that the Liberals have taken to government accountability and ethics.

These last couple of weeks, in particular, the government House leader, other Liberal members and the Prime Minister in his press conferences, who would never say this in the House of Commons because he would be held to account on it, have effectively said that it is the Conservatives who have been obstructionists, that somehow is the opposition's fault that the government cannot get anything accomplished.

A constituent shared with me an analogy that I will share with members. It is a bit like students, after having received the syllabus for the school year, coming upon the night before the deadline for a major assignment at the end of the course and all of a sudden realizing they had a lot of work to do but did very little or nothing and now they have a choice: They can either admit their failures or they can blame, pivot and make excuses. The Liberals have chosen to do the latter by blaming the Conservatives for obstruction, rather than acknowledging that they are the ones in charge and that they have utterly failed in their legislative management. If this is any indication of how the Liberals have managed government over the last six years, no wonder our country is facing some major challenges.

● (1220)

Bill C-30 is a large bill and it addresses many aspects of COVID response program changes to other aspects of the functioning of government. I am going to get into those specific things.

However, I want to touch on a couple of things that have not received a lot of airtime, so to speak, one of which is the proposed amendment to the Canada Elections Act. The part of the Elections Act that talks about misleading statements during an election was struck down by a court ruling. The government has inserted in the bill, somewhat innocuously, an amendment to the act that would include the words “knowingly mislead” during an election.

There should be a lot of discussion on the “knowingly mislead” part, especially when we see the failures of the current government to uphold elections commitments, its pivoting away from promises made and, certainly, the astounding level of mistrust that is faced across political discourse these days. I find it troubling that this has not been debated extensively. It calls into question some of the purposes associated with why that would be inserted into the back of a budget implementation bill.

The second thing, and this is typically Liberal, is that in the budget implementation bill, the government plans to rename the gas tax fund. This is the Liberal agenda at its best. It takes something, re-names it, shines it up a bit, gives it a little spit and polish, and then suggests they have done Canadians a great service with this new program with its fancy new name. That appears to be what Liberals have done with the gas tax fund, which will be called the Canada community building fund going forward.

The new name certainly has a ring to it, and most Canadians might say that it is a great idea, with grant applications and funds going to municipalities. However, it is very important to highlight that it is simply a change in name of a program, which has some of the challenges associated with government accountability and the increased costs. Then I expect to hear a flurry of election spending announcements, promoted by the infrastructure of government, as we saw prior to the 2019 election. We are already seeing cabinet ministers jet-setting across the country, using the tools they have at their disposal to make a myriad of promises prior to the election.

We are going to see a whole bunch of promises related to this new fund, but the Liberals probably will not call it a new fund. However, under a new name, the Liberals will certainly claim credit for the work, even though it was not the Liberals who brought forward that fund, and how it has benefited many municipalities, including some in Battle River—Crowfoot.

I am glad to have had the opportunity to put that on the record so Canadians know that simply renaming something does not give the government of the day credit.

There are extensions to many aspects of COVID programming and there are some concerns related to not being able to address some of the folks who have fallen through the cracks. There are further changes to health transfers, some of which are very needed. I would suggest the dollars are a little too late when it comes to vaccinations, which speaks to the Liberal strategy. If we had been on time with vaccines, we would not have had a third wave. This was the Prime Minister's third wave, when it comes to the delays we face.

● (1225)

As I have come to the end of my speech, I will simply say this. Parliament is an institution that represents Canadians, and to hear that the government is trying to circumvent, at every cost, the need for this place to carefully and thoughtfully debate and discuss legislation, including something as significant as the bill before us, Bill C-30, is very troubling. It is very troubling to hear the Liberals try to circumvent and dismiss the need for what should be of absolute importance to every single one of us.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Julie Vignola (Beauport—Limoulou, BQ): Madam Speaker, like my colleague, I took the time to read and analyze the budget. When taking notes, I use a red pen to indicate interference in Quebec's and the provinces' jurisdictions. There was a lot of red ink.

What does my colleague think of this aspect of the budget and jurisdictional meddling?

Government Orders

[English]

Mr. Damien Kurek: Madam Speaker, it has become standard practice for successive Liberal governments, whether through direct legislative means, as we see in this bill, or through the myriad of other regulatory or political mechanisms, to blur the lines between the different levels of government.

Our federation works because there has to be respect between the different levels of government, and unfortunately we have seen a significant erosion of that over the last six years. It has led to an increased level of alienation in various regions of the country. Certainly it is being felt in western Canada. A lot of that points back to a Liberal government that refuses to stay within the lines of what our country was intended to be and how the federation was intended to operate.

It is incredibly troubling that time and time again we see an intrusion into provincial jurisdiction by the federal government. It is the Ottawa-knows-best mentality. That may make for great press conferences and great spending announcements, but it is not how leadership works. Leadership needs to be working with provincial partners and—

• (1230)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I have to allow time for other questions.

The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands has the floor.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the member to expand on his comment that the federal government is going into jurisdiction that is provincial territory. The only thing I can think of offhand in this regard is the fight over the price on pollution, which the Supreme Court said was within the federal government's jurisdiction.

Can the member elaborate on where the federal government seems to be going into territory that it should not be?

Mr. Damien Kurek: Madam Speaker, the member emphasizes the problem. Time and time again, he refuses to acknowledge that there are regions of the country that demand respect in our federation. The Liberal government has refused to do this too, even in various pieces of legislation. I think about Bill C-48, Bill C-69 and even the debate around carbon pricing. The federal government has the ability to impose its will on provinces, but the question that should be asked is whether or not it should. The problem is that we have a Liberal government that refuses to respect anyone who disagrees with any aspect of the way it approaches politics, the legislation it puts forward—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Vancouver East has the floor.

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Madam Speaker, we know that during the pandemic inequalities have increased. The ultrarich are becoming richer than ever and those who need help are still struggling to get by. However, we do not see a wealth tax or a pandemic profiteering tax in this budget bill, Bill C-30. In fact, the government has opted to do more consultation in tackling the problem of tax havens.

Does the member think that this is the right approach, or does he think the NDP's proposal to bring forward a wealth tax and a profiteering tax at this time is the right way to go?

Mr. Damien Kurek: Madam Speaker, the member asks a question that strikes at the heart of the way the Liberals have pulled the wool over the eyes of Canadians. They are trying to outflank the NDP on the left regarding policy measures, and when it comes to actual implementation to deal with the things they promised to deal with, they end up simply saying that they will consult going forward or they back away from their commitments entirely. That is a further troubling trend we see, and the government is not being honest with Canadians. With a lot of the COVID programming, we have seen that, increasingly, it is the elites who are benefiting from the billions of dollars that were meant to—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Resuming debate, the hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, I would like to underscore today the importance of National Indigenous Peoples Day in Canada. We have much to reflect upon and much to do in terms of the justice that is required for true and meaningful national reconciliation.

From the very beginning of the pandemic, the member for Burnaby South and the NDP caucus have been pushing for supports that can really make a difference in people's lives. In the beginning, the Prime Minister proposed initial supports for the pandemic that were barely \$1,000 a month. That is far below the poverty line, and it was the serious proposal by the Prime Minister. Members will recall that the member for Burnaby South and the NDP caucus pushed very hard to get that amount above poverty levels, above dire levels. We understood the magnitude of the pandemic and the impacts that were being felt in people's lives, so we pushed for an adequate level of support and ultimately they got \$2,000 a month through the CERB, which became the CRB.

It is to our utmost dismay that we are now debating a bill that takes us back to where the Prime Minister originally wanted to go, with barely over \$1,000 a month for people struggling to make ends meet during the pandemic who are unable to work because their businesses have closed. Whole sectors, including the tourism sector, have repeatedly raised concerns about the fact that the pandemic is not over yet and that there is no place for a victory lap. Indeed, the variants we are seeing are indicating, in some countries and regions, a disturbing number of new cases. In fact, we are seeing this even in the case of individuals who have been vaccinated with two doses.

Government Orders

People are subject to these variants, which are disturbingly starting to creep up in various parts of our planet and in some parts of our country, yet the government has persisted from the very beginning, with a budget announcement and now with Bill C-30, in slashing the benefits that Canadians so vitally depend on. They need those benefits to put food on the table, to keep a roof over their heads and often to pay for medication because the government broke its promise to put in place public universal pharmacare. However, we still have the situation where the government continues to insist that slashing benefits to below the poverty line is somehow in the best interests of Canadians. This is something the New Democrats have raised from the very beginning and continue to raise as a broad concern. As the variants disturbingly start to make progress across the country, this should be a concern for the Prime Minister and the government.

There are other aspects of this bill that the NDP has raised broad concerns about. One is seniors, who often live below the poverty line. They will not be given an OAS increase unless they are 75 and over, even though we know the poverty rate among seniors who are 65 to 75. That is another measure that makes no sense at all. We raised this at committee and offered amendments, but the government continues to refuse to do the right thing and put in place a broad level of OAS support that lifts seniors up, regardless of their age, and does not create two classes of seniors.

Broadly, our biggest concern with Bill C-30 has been the lack of vision in how we get through the pandemic and rebuild afterward. As my colleague, the member for Vancouver East, has pointed out, there is no wealth tax, there is no pandemic profits tax and there are no concrete measures against tax havens. Despite the plethora of documentation showing that Canadians and profitable corporations are taking their profits overseas, which is well documented in the Panama papers, the Paradise papers, the Bahamas papers and the Isle of Man scam, the government has not, after six years, brought a single charge against any of the Canadians or profitable Canadian companies guilty of tax evasion. Despite the fact that the information is freely available to the public, not a single time has it said that this is wrong and we should do something about it.

• (1235)

It strikes me as incredibly hypocritical for the government to say that it restored some of the cuts to the CRA and that is all it needs to do, when we have databases with the names of thousands of Canadians and profitable Canadian corporations and the government has refused to do a single thing about this issue. It has not charged a single Canadian. It has not charged a single profitable Canadian corporation.

As members know, the Parliamentary Budget Officer has indicated how serious this is. It is something that costs Canadians, in terms of tax dollars, an astounding \$25 billion a year. Addressing the lack of a wealth tax, the lack of a pandemic profits tax and the refusal to take action against tax havens would make such a profound difference in our quality of life. We are talking about \$25 billion to \$40 billion annually that would be available to provide supports for seniors, for students and for people with disabilities, and to broaden our education system. We could lock in place public universal pharmacare. We could put in place dental care, which my colleague

from St. John's East proposed and the Liberals voted against just a few days ago.

Today, on National Indigenous Peoples Day, we are talking about the fact that there are dozens and dozens of Canadian indigenous communities that do not even have safe drinking water, yet the government continues to say that it cannot do anything about the issue because it would cost too much. The reality, as members know, is quite different. The reality is that the government seems to rely on providing supports to the ultrarich. It does it with impunity and does it regularly, and it does not take care of the rest of Canadians, who have real, meaningful needs that have not been addressed by this bill, nor by government action over the last six years.

I can tell members about the heart of the housing affordability crisis in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia and in my riding. In that context, in the two communities I proudly represent, New Westminster and Burnaby, housing costs have spiralled out of control. However, the government has done very little about this. It makes noise about having contributed in some way to building housing units, but the B.C. government has built more new housing units than the rest of the country put together. The federal government made a small contribution to that, but it has tried to take credit for a program that was put in place by the B.C. government. This is another measure that could make a substantial difference in the quality of life of Canadians, yet the government refuses to implement it.

The member of Parliament for Nunavut did a housing tour showing, in vivid and appalling detail, the housing crisis in Nunavut and in the north, yet the government has not acted. It has refused to take the actions that would make a difference in the quality of life of indigenous communities and throughout northern Canada. It is perplexing to say the least that a government that could have put in place the tools to make a difference in people's lives has chosen not to do that. The government could have made substantial investments in this budget and with this budget implementation act, but it has refused to do it.

To add to that, I will come back, in a circular way, to my initial argument. The Liberals are cutting the emergency response benefit at the most critical time. Canadians who have tried to get through the last 15 months and have managed to survive thanks to the member for Burnaby South and the NDP caucus, which pushed for a CERB that was above the poverty line, are now seeing, looming on the horizon, a government that wants to lower the emergency response benefit to below the poverty line. That is unacceptable, and we will continue to push the government to do the right thing and not cut the emergency response benefit.

• (1240)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Madam Speaker, I have a finance question.

Government Orders

Two great economic historians from Harvard University, Reinhart and Rogoff, have listed five precursors to a debt crisis: asset price inflation, particularly housing price inflation; long-term current account deficits, that is to say buying from the world more than we sell to the world; a drop in output, as we experienced last year with the \$100-billion drop in GDP; rising household leverage, and we have the highest household-debt-to-income ratio in the G7; and an increase in overall indebtedness. We now have \$8.6 trillion of household, corporate and governmental debt combined, which is four dollars of debt for every one dollar of GDP.

If interest rates rise before these incredible debt ratios decline, does the member believe we could face a debt crisis in Canada of which I have warned in the past and am warning in the present? Does he share that concern, and what would he do to avoid it?

• (1245)

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, the member for Carleton and I disagree on many things. We sometimes agree as well, but I always enjoy working with him at the finance committee.

He has raised something that the NDP identified years ago. The household debt crisis is a crisis that was enacted under both the former Conservative government and the current Liberal government by a refusal to put in place a fair tax system. When we force Canadian families to go massively into debt for post-secondary education, to go into debt to pay for medication that their family depends on and to go into debt for housing because there is no affordable housing available, that creates a household debt crisis. What we have seen under former Conservative government and the current Liberal government is a refusal to force the ultrarich to pay their fair share. The household debt crisis is intrinsically linked to the crisis that we have with a lack of a fair tax system that I mentioned in my speech.

There is \$25 billion a year going into overseas tax havens, no wealth tax, no pandemic profits tax and a refusal to make the ultrarich pay their fair share.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Denis Trudel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, BQ): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his remarks. He accurately pointed out which sectors of the economy have been hardest hit during the pandemic and discussed seniors, people with disabilities and the housing crisis. In Quebec alone, 40,000 people are waiting for social housing, for low-income housing, and 450,000 people have urgent housing needs. It is a big deal.

During the pandemic, the government rolled out its big Canada emergency wage subsidy to help people working for struggling businesses. The Conservative Party, the Liberal Party and the New Democratic Party all claimed the subsidy, which I find scandalous. The Liberals and the NDP have not said anything about reimbursing the money. We will be campaigning in two months, and the NDP is going to use government money, which was supposed to go to struggling workers, to pay for lawn signs. Is my colleague not the least bit embarrassed by that?

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, we fought for non-profits to be eligible for the wage subsidy to ensure that organizations would not have to choose between laying off employees or keeping them on staff.

As the member just said, the member for Burnaby South and the NDP caucus pushed the hardest for this initiative which, as the member knows, already existed in other European countries, for example. This was important for Canada. The government initially refused, but the NDP continued to push for it, as we normally do, being the workers' party. We want people to stay employed.

We were successful, as everyone knows. The subsidy allowed for workers, including Quebec workers, to remain employed.

[*English*]

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to rise in the House today and speak to the government's budget. I have been spending a lot of time talking to people in my constituency about where they think this country should go coming out of the COVID-19 pandemic. What does the future look like? What are the things we need to be focusing on as we move forward as a country?

There are three big priorities that I am hearing from my constituents in terms of their concerns of the direction of the government. Their concerns are around rising government debt. Their concerns are around the failure to support the energy sector and the role that the energy sector will play in our economy going forward. The third concern I hear a great deal about in my riding right now is freedom of speech and attacks on freedom of speech that we hear from the government.

With respect to Bill C-30, the government's budget bill, let us zero in on the first of those two points: government debt and the energy sector. As we come out of the COVID-19 pandemic, people are looking to see what kinds of plans are in place to allow our economy to grow and prosper and be firing on all cylinders again. In order to do, that we need strong public finances. In order to do, that we need to have support for our key natural resource and other sectors that really drive prosperity.

We have to have sound public finance and we have to have revenue coming in to government coffers as a result of jobs being created, opportunities being created in our key sectors. There is a great deal of concern about the public debt that has been run up over the course of this pandemic, but it did not start with the pandemic. Let us remember, when the Prime Minister took office, we had a balanced budget. Canada had been through the global financial crisis. We ran deficits during those years, but Canada was back in a balanced budget position in 2015.

In fact, over the course of the tenure of Prime Minister Stephen Harper, Canada's debt-to-GDP ratio had gone down. We had been through the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression. Over the course of the tenure of that prime minister, through those incredibly difficult circumstances, the debt-to-GDP ratio had gone down.

Government Orders

We had a prime minister coming in and saying, “the good times will last forever, do not worry about it, the budget will balance itself, so we can run modest deficits”. Recall that 2015 election campaign, three \$10-billion deficits followed by a balanced budget in year four: that was the promise made by the Prime Minister. Teeny, tiny deficits, \$10-billion deficits for three years followed by a balanced budget.

What happened? In the first year under finance minister Bill Morneau, the government had a deficit that essentially ate up its promised deficit allotment for the three years all in one year. The Prime Minister had not foreseen perhaps, or maybe he did and just did not tell us, that when opening the floodgates with money for everything, money for this and money for that and we do not have to worry about raising the revenue for it, that can become a bottomless pit. We have seen over time this bottomless pit of willingness to go into debt get deeper and deeper. Instead of three years of \$10-billion deficits and then a balanced budget, we had four years in the order of about \$30-billion deficits. During relatively good years, the government ran up another \$100 billion worth of debt.

Part of the reason we need to have strong public finances is to preserve that capacity during challenging circumstances to run deficits. In the midst of a global financial crisis as we faced in 2008-09, in the face of the pandemic as we dealt with in this Parliament, it is very often necessary to have some degree of deficit spending. However, if we are running deficits already prior to that period and then go further into deficit, we increase our risk of a long-term debt crisis. Certainly we run up massive amounts of more debt that have to be paid off at some point.

The government's long-term fiscal plan coming out of this pandemic involves very large deficits in perpetuity. There is no plan for us to ever get back at any point, even to the \$10-billion figure that the Liberals talked about when they ran in 2015. The long-term plan is to spend more than we have every single year.

We have different parties in the House with different approaches to spending. Conservatives believe that it is important for us to move toward a balanced budget—

• (1250)

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I remind the member that he should not have any devices that make sounds near him.

The hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan.

[*English*]

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, I thought it was my children calling, worried about the debt they are going to have to pay off in a few years as a result of the profligate spending of the current government.

As I was saying, Conservatives emphasize the importance of moving toward a balanced budget. I do not agree with them, but I give the New Democrats credit for saying we should be spending more and increasing taxes. That is not an approach that is going to lead to long-term prosperity, but at least they sort of have under-

stood at certain times that if they are going to spend more they have to pay for it somehow.

The Liberal government, uniquely in this place, takes the position that we could consistently spend more than we have: that, during good years, we can run what were historically considered large deficits of \$30 billion; and then, during challenging circumstances, we can run astronomical deficits of 10 times that. Notably, this one Prime Minister has accumulated more debt during his time in office than all of the previous prime ministers had up until 2015. This is the great debt Prime Minister. That is his legacy to our children.

It is understandable that people in my riding are coming to me, asking, “What is the plan here, where is all this money coming from, and how are we ever going to get out from under this?” I tell them the reality is that the money we spend today, we are going to have to pay off. It is going to lead to higher taxes, lower social spending or both, in the future, or maybe the government's way of getting out of it is simply printing more money and leaving it to inflation. That too is a form of taxation. It is a form of the government reaching into people's pockets and, through inflation, reducing the value of the money they have. Therefore, yes, we should be very concerned about debt.

The way we can move forward as an economy is going to also require strong job growth and a reoriented, rational economic policy that gets our debt under control. However, also part of balancing the budget is promoting growth. We need to have support for what have always been the engines of economic development in this country, and those are the natural resources and manufacturing sectors.

Conservatives have said very clearly that we want to support economic growth in all sectors of the economy. We want to support in all sectors and in all regions. For energy workers in Alberta, for forestry workers in B.C., for forestry workers and manufacturing workers in Quebec, for people working on the assembly line in Ontario, from coast to coast, Conservatives are supportive of those vital sectors. That is where we differ from the government. The government is disdainful of our energy and manufacturing sectors. The government is imposing additional burdens on those sectors. The Liberals have this notion that the sectors that have driven our success for all of our history could somehow be shut out of economic recovery and, instead, government could pick winners and losers and be subsidizing what it thinks are going to be the technology and the jobs of the future.

Government Orders

If we are going to put the focus on jobs and opportunity for Canadians, then we need to come back to those tried-and-true sectors that have delivered prosperity in the past. That means removing barriers from our oil and gas sector. That means supporting private-sector-driven stimulus, the development of pipelines, energy projects that employ so many Canadians, not just in my riding, not just in Alberta but people from other parts of the country who invest in or come to Alberta or who create component products that are then used in energy-related manufacturing as well as extraction.

We have this opportunity, going forward. We have an opportunity to secure our future; that is, to get our debt under control, to work toward a balanced budget over time, and to do so by controlling spending but also by supporting growth.

On the other hand, we have a government across the way who says we can shut down our traditional sectors and at the same time we could spend more money than we have. The Liberals are cutting the knees out of our revenue sources and they are continuing to insist on spending more and more. It is not going to work to undermine the sources of job growth and opportunity growth and government revenue and, on the other hand, to just keep insisting on spending more and more money. That is a recipe for economic disaster. The government is just bullishly moving forward in this direction that will be disastrous for our long-term economic well-being. We need a change. We need a government that is committed to securing our future.

• (1255)

Mr. Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to thank my hon. colleague for his great speech on this important topic. He spoke a bit about cutting the knees out of our economy. Perhaps he was talking about the lack of pipelines getting built in this country. I wonder if he can talk a little more about that.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, what we saw from the current government, immediately upon taking office, was killing the northern gateway pipeline and imposing all kinds of conditions on the possibility of an east-to-west pipeline that would connect Canadian energy with Canadian consumers. It has killed pipeline project after pipeline project, and that is obviously undermining investor confidence. At the beginning of this Parliament, there was the Teck Frontier project, a project that had been through all the hoops. Members of the government caucus openly lobbied to kill that project, which actually had a net-zero target built into it. We see project after project that go through all the steps, good projects that create jobs and take triple bottom line—

• (1300)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): We have a lot of interesting questions.

The hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the member made reference to job creation. It is important to recognize that even pre-pandemic, this government had the lowest historic un-

employment rates. In fact, in the first four to five years of governance, we created well over one million jobs, which is far superior to Stephen Harper's record.

When it comes to the deficit, even the Conservatives have been unanimously supporting the expenditure of billions of dollars through the wage subsidy and CERB programs. Is the Conservative Party now saying we should not have brought forward the wage subsidy and CERB programs? Is that—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, the member is quite correct that we sought to work with the government during the very challenging circumstances of COVID, but that does not mean we were not critical of some aspects of the implementation. There were many problems with the way these programs rolled out. We said there were ways they could have been constructed better. For instance, we talked about having a back-to-work bonus to make it easier for people receiving CERB to get back to work part time without losing all of their benefits. If the government had implemented some of our suggestions, we would have been able to be there for Canadians and also take into consideration the fiscal circumstances. We can do both at the same time; we can take both under consideration, but the government failed to do so.

Much of the spending is far beyond these benefit programs. There are the benefit programs, but we were in a seriously dangerous deficit situation even before the pandemic.

Mr. Jack Harris (St. John's East, NDP): Madam Speaker, the hon. member talked a lot about the recovery, but we are still in the middle of the pandemic. We hear constantly about the tourism sector and the hospitality industry, many of whose members have not survived. They need and want and are crying out for a continuation of the rent and wage subsidies for a while so they can survive long enough to recover. Do the hon. member and his party support that continuation so these businesses can survive long enough to enjoy a recovery and keep people employed?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, it has been a pleasure working with this colleague. I wish him well in his planned retirement.

There are different things happening in different parts of the country. My province has announced a complete reopening starting at the beginning of July. There are different circumstances in different places and different trajectories. Hopefully, over time we are expecting the country as a whole to be on its way out of the pandemic as a result of various factors, including the availability of vaccines.

Government Orders

I would say to the member's question that a targeted approach is important. There are certain sectors that have been hurt more than others, and there are certain sectors for which the impacts will be there much longer. Therefore, it is important to look at the changes in the circumstances and how some sectors are continuing to be affected while others are coming out of it. Certainly, we would provide the tools and incentives for returning to a situation of growth as quickly as possible, and that does require a bit of sensitivity with respect to the different circumstances.

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to see you in the chair today, giving me this opportunity, I guess, to speak until the end of the programming motion that has been forced upon us because the government and the House leadership on its side seem to really want to do their homework at the very last minute. As a constant procrastinator in my youth, I appreciate that, but with old age we get wiser. I have come around to not doing that in my personal life and making sure that I am on top of my work before the clock strikes the eleventh hour.

What I am going to talk about today with regard to this piece of legislation, the budget bill, the first BIA, is what Albertans and constituents in my riding have cared about for the last 20 years, which is equalization, equalization and equalization. That is some of the biggest unfairness in our Confederation, and I think every Albertan would say so.

Typically in the BIA, the budget implementation act, we would see modifications made to the formula that governs equalization. I remember being on the finance committee when this was indeed the case. I actually missed it at the time, but the government simply rolled over the same formula and then accused the Conservatives at the time of having supported this formula back in 2014. The Liberals said it was not a big deal because it was the same thing.

Here is the deal. Over the last two years, the provincial government in Alberta has run a \$24-billion deficit, if COVID spending is excluded. Once COVID spending is included, it will approach a \$40-billion deficit over two fiscal years in the province of Alberta, my home province, the province I call home, the place that adopted me. It is patently unfair that Albertans are continuing to see major contributions to federal coffers because, after all, it is not a cheque cut from Edmonton to Ottawa; it is the totality of federal income taxes levied on workers in Alberta, and then the redistribution is based on a formula and the fiscal capacity of the average of the 10 provinces combined together. Now, there are a lot of different revenues included. There are different calculations being made.

At the Fraser Institute, Ben Eisen and another analyst made a calculation that demonstrated that in Canada, equalization and the fiscal capacity of the provinces are actually converging. Over the last five and a half years, my province has gotten poorer because of Liberal policies out of Ottawa. My province is now so poor that Albertans are only 20% above the median income of the people in Ontario, whereas before we were in the range of 80% to 90% above. That is a significant decrease in the common prosperity of the people of my province. It is directly related to policies that the Liberal government has introduced. It has stymied the growth of the oil and gas sector. I have not seen a single major oil and gas project be proposed and built since the Liberals took power. Actual-

ly, every single project that was completed had been started under the previous Conservative government.

Equalization by 2025-26 fiscal year is expected to be \$25 billion. That is according to the government's own figures. The total number is actually growing over time. It is not shrinking over time, and it should be shrinking because our fiscal capacity is actually converging. The provinces are actually becoming much closer together to the average. One would think that over time there would be less money to redistribute because the provinces are more even, but that is not what is going on.

I want to recognize a member of the New Democratic Party, the member for St. John's East, who has stated several times how unfair equalization is to his home province of Newfoundland and Labrador. I had the distinct privilege of being able to travel with different parliamentary committees to the province as well, and I have read the Greene report. Lady Greene provided a report on the state of the finances in Newfoundland and Labrador. It is an eye-opening read. It is not just unfair for Alberta. It is not just unfair for Saskatchewan and other "have" provinces contributing to our shared prosperity in this country; it is also unfair to Newfoundland and Labrador, which is seeing an immense drop in its provincial revenues and barely any finances being made up in the fiscal stabilization program, the FSP, the so-called equalization rebate.

Let it not be said that we Conservatives and I have not done something about it. I have tabled Bill C-263, the equalization and transfers fairness act, which would have eliminated that cap, but in this budget, in the BIA, all the Liberal government is committing to do is simply increase the cap to another random number.

● (1305)

The Liberals have tripled the cap now to a number that I do not think is defensible. If the cap had been eliminated entirely, my home province of Alberta would have been eligible for a \$3-billion refund because of the significant loss in revenues. It is not as if the federal government does not have increasing revenues. I was just looking at the numbers. The income taxes that the federal government is forecasted to raise will go up by \$46 billion over five years. That is \$46 billion of additional revenue coming in, and it still cannot balance the budget within a five-year timetable.

To conclude, I want to be clear that if Albertans want to know more, if members across the country want to know more, I encourage them to follow Fairness Alberta and Dr. Bill Bewick's work, which gives an eye-opening account by the numbers, not rhetoric, just by the numbers, of the hardship my province is being asked to bear in order to pay for the finances of the federal government, and we cannot afford it. We cannot afford this government. We cannot afford another five years of nothing being done on equalization. The formula needs to be changed, and there needs to be greater fairness for the people of Alberta.

I will finish with a Yiddish proverb, because I know members know how much I appreciate them: "Let your mouth not speak what the eyes do not see." Albertans have been seeing deep unfairness over the last five and a half years. We have suffered one of the greatest—

• (1310)

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): It being 1:11 p.m., pursuant to order made on Monday, June 14, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the report stage of the bill now before the House.

The question is on Motion No. 2.

[*English*]

Shall I dispense?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[*Chair read text of motion to House*]

[*Translation*]

If a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes to request a recorded division or that the motion be adopted on division, I would ask them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

The hon. member for Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola.

[*English*]

Mr. Dan Albas: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded division.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Pursuant to order made on Monday, January 25, the division stands deferred until later this day at the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN NET-ZERO EMISSIONS ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

BILL C-12—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

Hon. Marie-Claude Bibeau (for the leader of the Government in the House of Commons) moved:

That, notwithstanding any standing order, special order or usual practice of the House, Bill C-12, An Act respecting transparency and accountability in Canada's efforts to achieve net-zero greenhouse gas emissions by the year 2050, shall be disposed of as follows:

- (a) the bill may be taken up at report stage immediately after the adoption of this order;
- (b) not more than one hour shall be allotted to the consideration of the bill at report stage and, at the conclusion of the time provided at report stage, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required for the purpose of this order, and in turn every question necessary for the disposal of the said stage of the bill shall be put forthwith and successively, without further debate or amendment, provided that, if a recorded division is requested on any motion, it shall not be deferred, except pursuant to Standing Order 76.1(8);
- (c) a motion for third reading may be made immediately after the bill has been concurred in at report stage;
- (d) when the bill is taken up at the third reading stage, a member of each recognized party and a member of the Green Party each be allowed to speak for not more than 10 minutes followed by five minutes for questions and comments and, at the conclusion of the time provided for debate or when no member rises to speak, whichever is earlier, all questions necessary for the disposal of the third reading stage of the bill shall be put forthwith and successively, without further

Government Orders

debate or amendment provided that, if a recorded division is requested on any motion, it shall not be deferred; and

(e) the House shall not adjourn until the proceedings on the bill have been completed, except pursuant to a motion proposed by a minister of the Crown, provided that once proceedings have been completed, the House may then proceed to consider other business or, if it has already passed the ordinary hour of daily adjournment, the House shall adjourn to the next sitting day.

• (1315)

[*English*]

Mr. Chris Bittle (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise today to speak to this motion, but I would like to focus my remarks on Bill C-12 itself and the importance of passing this legislation.

As I hope all members in this House know, climate change is a global threat and Canadians rightly expect us to take action to counter the climate crisis. The net-zero emissions accountability act is a fundamental part of this plan. If we do not reduce emissions rapidly and consistently down to net-zero by 2050 at the latest, we will not achieve the goals of the Paris Agreement. This is an existential threat to the planet on which there is global consensus.

At the Leaders Summit on Climate convened by President Biden in April, the Prime Minister joined 39 other world leaders of nations that account for more than half of the world's economy as they committed to set emissions reductions, the pace required globally, to limit warming to 1.5°C. We have a responsibility to all Canadians and future generations to act now.

In November 2020, our government tabled Bill C-12, an act that would enshrine in legislation Canada's commitment to achieve net-zero emissions by 2050 and provide a framework of accountability and transparency to ensure governments undertake the planning, take the actions and conduct the monitoring needed to achieve that goal.

In May 2021, Bill C-12 was referred to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development for consideration and clause-by-clause. During this study, our government listened to the broad range of feedback and worked collaboratively with members of the House of Commons in order to further strengthen and improve the bill. Several amendments spanning virtually all areas of the bill were adopted by the environment committee to reinforce Bill C-12.

This is the version now before the House of Commons, and I will summarize the amendments that were adopted. First, new language has been added to the preamble to state clearly that climate change is a global problem requiring immediate and ambitious action by all governments in Canada. In addition, the preamble lists Canada's international and domestic greenhouse gas emissions reporting obligations as such under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act.

Government Orders

As we know, the objective of Bill C-12 is for Canada to achieve net-zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050. The new version of Bill C-12 clarifies that nothing in the act would preclude Canada from attaining net-zero emissions before 2050. In other words, net-zero by 2050 is the minimum goal. If we can reach the goal earlier it would be even better, and nothing in this law would prevent that kind of ambition.

The committee also worked on improving the act's provisions in relation to targets. First, the committee voted in favour of codifying the 2030 greenhouse gas emissions target as Canada's nationally determined contribution for that year under the Paris Agreement, which the Prime Minister announced at the recent Leaders Summit on Climate as 40% to 45% below our 2005 levels. In addition, each greenhouse gas emission target set under the act must be a progression from the previous one. This amendment would prevent backsliding on Canada's greenhouse gas emissions targets. Lastly, each target must be as ambitious as Canada's most recent nationally determined contribution under the Paris Agreement.

Under this new version of the act, all targets after 2030 would be set at least 10 years before the beginning of its corresponding milestone year instead of the five years in advance provided by the original version of the bill. This new provision would ensure the government starts planning for future targets earlier and would align with Canada's current practice under the UNFCCC.

Going a step further, the committee adopted a complementary amendment that would strengthen the act by requiring the Minister of Environment and Climate Change to publish within a year of setting the targets for 2035, 2040 and 2045 a high-level description of key emissions reductions measures to achieve that target, as well as the latest projection of greenhouse gas emissions.

This provision would, for example, ensure the targets set for 2035 in 2025 are accompanied by a high-level description of those measures that will be undertaken to reach the target, as well as the most current emissions projections. The detailed plan to achieve the 2035 target would be due no later than December 2029.

With respect to the criteria for setting the targets, the Minister of Environment and Climate Change must now consider submissions and advice provided by the advisory body in addition to the best scientific information available and Canada's international commitments with respect to climate change.

Another set of amendments enshrines the role of indigenous knowledge. The preamble now states the Government of Canada's commitment to taking indigenous knowledge into account when carrying out the purposes of this act, and a related amendment would require the minister to consider indigenous knowledge when setting greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets.

● (1320)

Year 2030 is not that far away, and Bill C-12 needs to provide accountability for taking action prior to 2030 as well as after that. To address this, the committee adopted a new provision that would require the inclusion of an interim greenhouse gas emissions objective for 2026 in the emissions reduction plan for 2030.

Further amendments would require additional progress reports in 2023, 2025 and 2027. These reports must now contain an update on the progress made towards achieving the 2026 interim objective. Moreover, the bill would now require that the first report to the Commissioner of the Environment and the Office of the Auditor General to be submitted by the end of 2024. Taken together, these changes would provide a midpoint check-in between now and 2030, and ensure meaningful accountability checkpoints over the next decade.

The committee also strengthened the planning requirements in the bill. The amended bill would now require the Minister of Environment and Climate Change to take into account the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, the submissions provided by the advisory body, and any other relevant consideration when establishing the plan.

It also prescribes some of the items that must be included in each plan, such as the description of how Canada's international commitments with respect to climate change are taken into account, projections of the annual greenhouse gas emission reductions resulting from the plan's combined measures and strategies, and a summary of the co-operative measures or agreements with the provinces and other governments in Canada.

Consultation is an important element of Bill C-12. Canadians, indigenous peoples of Canada, environmental and non-government organizations, and other interested parties would be able to provide opportunities and make submissions at various stages of the act's implementation, such as when the minister has to set a target or plan.

To strengthen the commitment to transparency, Bill C-12 now includes a provision that would require the Minister of Environment and Climate Change to publish a report on the results of the consultations carried out in relation to targets and plans.

The committee also approved the progress report requirements. As I previously noted, the 2023, 2025 and 2027 progress reports on the 2030 target must also include an update on the progress made to achieving the 2026 interim objective. In addition, the 2023 report, as the midpoint between now and 2025, would be required to contain an assessment of the 2030 target and include changes being made to correct the course, if needed, to achieve the target.

Other amendments would also require more content to be included in the progress report, such as Canada's most recent published greenhouse gas emissions projection for the next milestone, and details on any additional measures that could be taken to increase the probability of achieving the target if projections indicate that a target will not be met.

Similar amendments were also adopted with respect to assessment reports with a view of ensuring they also contain a summary of Canada's most recent official greenhouse gas emissions, inventory and information submitted by Canada under its international commitments on climate change, as well as an assessment of how key co-operative measures or agreements with provinces or other governments in Canada described in the plan contribute to Canada's efforts to achieve the target.

The committee also adopted a number of changes with respect to the advisory body. The act now formally establishes the net-zero advisory body. It specifies that the net-zero advisory body would provide independent, forward-looking advice on achieving net-zero emissions by 2050, which also includes providing advice on targets and plans. These amendments within the act align with the current net-zero advisory body's terms of reference, which were published by the Minister of Environment and Climate Change in February 2021. Further, the act would now require the Minister of Environment and Climate Change to publish the advisory body's terms of reference and amendments made to them.

This strengthens the act by increasing the transparency of the process. With respect to the membership of the net-zero advisory body, the amended bill contains new provisions that would require the Minister of Environment and Climate Change to consider the need for the net-zero advisory body, as a whole, to have expertise in or knowledge of, among other things, climate change science, indigenous knowledge, physical or social sciences, climate change policy at the national, subnational and international levels, energy supply and demand, and relevant technologies.

With regard to the annual report of the net-zero advisory body, the committee adopted a new provision requiring the net-zero advisory body to take into account a range of factors when preparing the report, including environmental, economic, social, technological and the best scientific information and knowledge, including indigenous knowledge, with respect to climate change.

• (1325)

This provision recognizes that multiple factors must be taken into account in developing a plan that meets the science-based objectives of the net-zero emissions by 2050 in a way that works best for Canada.

Moreover, in line with the objective of keeping the government accountable and transparent toward Canadians, the act now clarifies that the net-zero advisory body's annual report must set out results of its engagement activities. It also requires the Minister of Environment and Climate Change to publish the report 30 days after receiving it and to respond publicly within 120 days. The minister's response must also address any target recommendations by the net-zero advisory body that differs from the one the minister has set.

The Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development plays an important role in the accountability regime established by the bill. Unlike the net-zero advisory body's report, which will provide forward-looking advice, the CESD will assess past performance of the government on its path to achieve net zero by 2050. Its first report is now to be submitted no later than 2024.

Government Orders

Finally, with respect to regulations made by the Governor in Council, the act has been modified to clarify that any regulation made by the Governor in Council under the act must align with the international standards to which Canada adheres.

Canadians are counting on us. They want assurance of Canada's sustained commitment to achieve net zero by 2050 and they want ongoing input into the consideration of the pathways to get there. By putting climate obligations into law, the net-zero emissions accountability act would ensure that governments are accountable for and transparent about their actions to combat climate change. Putting Bill C-12 into law as soon as possible is critical to this effort.

I am very proud of the collaborative work that took place during the committee study. Those efforts have resulted in a strengthened and improved version of the act, one that provides greater predictability, transparency and accountability. This collaborative work will continue and is crucial to successfully fight the climate crisis and transition toward a resilient and strong low-carbon future. Our government is committed to doing just that.

It is therefore my hope we can advance the bill and this motion to a final vote on this revised and improved version of Bill C-12, and allow it to be considered by the Senate as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Madam Speaker, the member and I sit on the environment committee together. He described the process of committee review as “collaborative”. The Conservatives actually supported the Bloc amendments as well as NDP and Liberal amendments. We actually came there to collaborate, but that particular parliamentary secretary and his team of Liberal members made a complete hash of the process.

He talked about indigenous knowledge. There was no indigenous representation at committee. The Assembly of First Nations brief came after the time for amendments. It was very clear that there was a political agenda between the NDP and the Liberals to slam through and not even support any other amendments.

When it comes to some of the amendments, I can see why the member only wants to talk to the bill and not to the process or even this motion. The Liberals have mishandled even getting this to Parliament. It has been over a week and a half since the committee finished.

The member referenced specifically amendments that would force the office of the environment commissioner to study or review the government's plan. That, effectively, is a cut because there is no extra funding to do this.

Government Orders

Why is the government always pushing it onto someone else's desk?

• (1330)

Mr. Chris Bittle: Madam Speaker, the Liberals on the committee have a minority. To get this through, there had to be collaboration.

In the budget debate, the hon. member was for this bill before he was against it. It is shocking that after voting against it, he is now crying foul about there not being enough collaboration. We worked with opposition parties to see this through. I have no doubt that the hon. member supports action on climate change. It seems his party does not and that is truly unfortunate, as he did his best to drag it out, stall it and prevent it from getting to the Senate.

We work with the opposition. We want to see this get through. Other parties are committed to climate action quickly and I think Canadians want to see rapid climate action. It is unfortunate the hon. member does not.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ): Madam Speaker, I can assure members that the Bloc Québécois approached its committee work from a standpoint of wanting to improve the process and the bill. Unfortunately, only one of the Bloc Québécois's 33 amendments was agreed to.

Nevertheless, I would like to concentrate on plans to increase Canadian oil sands development, which is incompatible with three things: limiting global warming to 1.5 degrees, achieving net zero by 2050 and hitting the targets for the milestone years in the act. Those are Environment Canada's targets, not the Bloc Québécois's. Would the parliamentary secretary comment on that?

[*English*]

Mr. Chris Bittle: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for her climate advocacy, but Bill C-12 would achieve measures similar to the Bloc's objectives in Bill C-215, and the amendments that were adopted by the committee confirm that. I know there was a concern from the Bloc about incorporating targets into law. I would remind my colleague that the government proposed an amendment to the committee to incorporate Canada's target within the legal text of the bill and the Bloc voted against it; it tried to defeat the amendment.

Again, there was an honest attempt to work collaboratively, and I hope we have the Bloc's support. In hearing from environmental groups—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley.

Mr. Taylor Bachrach (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Madam Speaker, I share the parliamentary secretary's view that we need to move expeditiously to get this bill into law, given the severity of the climate crisis.

One of the key differences between Bill C-12 and the gold standard legislation out of the U.K. is that the latter uses a carbon budget framework, and it has been proven, through its example, to work magnificently. However, the Canadian government chose a different approach in this legislation. The minister came to commit-

tee and tried to explain to us why that was, and frankly his explanation did not make very much sense.

I wonder if the parliamentary secretary could take a stab at sharing the rationale for not using the proven approach, which is the use of carbon budgets as in the U.K.

• (1335)

Mr. Chris Bittle: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for his work on this bill to help us strengthen it.

Carbon budgets are one path forward. We took the view that this should be a made-in-Canada approach moving forward. The approach is tailored to Canadian circumstances, ensuring the target setting and planning of the key measures, including sectoral measures, are made with the collaboration of all governments in Canada, including indigenous people, industry, non-governmental organizations and Canadians. The level of ambition, or of a target or of a budget is more important than of the two approaches used. Canada has recently announced a highly ambitious new target for 2030, 40% to 45% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions below 2005—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith.

Mr. Paul Manly (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, GP): Madam Speaker, I would like to talk about the collaborative effort that happened in this committee.

The hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands put forward a number of amendments and, in fact, one of those amendments was voted down by the Liberals and the NDP, even though it was the same wording as a Liberal amendment that came after it. They wasted an hour scrambling around to try to reword that amendment they voted down to get that language back in the bill. A number of really great amendments put forward by the Green Party were blocked.

This is supposed to be a bill about accountability, but the only accountability in this comes after 2028, and the accountability is that we can vote out the government. That is not accountability. The citizens can do that in any election. We need a carbon budget like the U.K. and New Zealand have, and we need actual accountability.

It would have been good to see a much stronger bill. I wonder if there are some comments about why we have not done that. What is this about collaboration and voting down amendments—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Chris Bittle: Madam Speaker, it is interesting to hear from members of the Green Party, who voted against the bill at second reading, who voted against it in principle and now cry foul that we should take their amendments at face value and wanting to be part of this process. It is clear they are not. It is disappointing to see their leader, instead of focusing on important environmental issues, attack the Minister of Finance for no apparent reason.

Government Orders

Perhaps the hon. member wants to look to his own caucus to see where the hon. member for Fredericton sits now and which party she thinks has a credible plan for the environment, and that includes Bill C-12.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would love to say that I listened very closely to the parliamentary secretary's intervention today, but I did not if I am being honest. He started off by saying that he hoped all members would know that climate change was a global threat. Then I spent 20 minutes trying to rationalize why 54% of the Conservative Party of Canada, one of the major forces in politics in Canada, did not believe climate change was a global threat.

Could the parliamentary secretary help me in wrapping my head around all this?

Mr. Chris Bittle: Madam Speaker, the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands is a leader in our caucus on the climate crisis and is always pushing the government to move in stronger ways.

It has been clear throughout this debate. I know a few members of the Conservative Party in the House were in favour of the bill initially before the rest of the caucus bullied them into voting against it. They voted against climate change being real at their convention.

I know a lot of Conservative voters out there believe climate change is real, but Conservative politicians do not support real measures. We even can look at the Leader of the Opposition's proposed carbon tax, which is "The more pollution you burn, the more you earn." There is no real environmental policy on that side of the House, which is disappointing. I am sure this is similar to the hon. member's riding, but 70% of residents in my riding voted for a party that had an incredible plan on climate change.

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Madam Speaker, is this not a strange set of circumstances? When the government House leader said that we would be debating Bill C-12 last week, I foolishly assumed he meant the actual bill. Multiple times last week it looked like maybe Bill C-12 would be debated, but no. The Liberals say that we Conservatives are delaying. Unfortunately, instead of debating the bill today, we are debating a motion to shut down debate on the bill because the government cannot seem to manage the House agenda at all. To say this bill is urgent after not calling it for months, and indeed after propping the House and delaying everything, is the height of hypocrisy. Therefore, here we are.

This is not the first disaster of management on this legislation by the current government. Indeed, it is just the most recent in a long list of failures relating to the bill. I would like to go through some of those here.

When the bill was first introduced, I stood in the House and said I would support the bill. That is true and on the record. However, at that time, I made the mistake of taking the minister at his word: that he was willing to work in good faith with opposition parties. Very quickly I was disabused of this notion.

The first domino was when the government pre-empted the bill entirely. It ignored its own promises and appointed the advisory

body. The minister had committed to working with us and with the oil and gas industry to develop the advisory group. In fact, the Minister of Natural Resources said, "We're not reaching net-zero without our oil and gas sector in this country. We're not reaching it." I agree with this minister and expected direct representation from this critical industry on the group advising government. Unfortunately, instead, the minister appointed a body with no direct oil and gas representation. It was full of people devoted to the death of that industry and the jobs and prosperity it brings.

There were some choice quotes and statements from various members of the advisory committee. One tweet thanked Greta Thunberg for calling on the Prime Minister to stop all oil and gas projects. Another rejected that fossil fuels could co-exist with climate action, rejecting the industry and its workers entirely. Another advocated for stopping all fossil fuel exports and another said, "Tomorrow, I'll join thousands gathering around Canada to call on premiers to act on climate and reject pipelines."

Members may think that I am done, but I am just getting started because all those were from one person: Catherine Abreu of the Climate Action Network.

Another board member, Kluane Adamek, again quoted Greta, advocating abandoning the fossil fuel economy. Simon Donner from UBC, another board member, called to halt all new oil sands projects and asked if we should cap production entirely.

To be clear, I am not saying that these people are not entitled to their own opinions and beliefs. We are a free country with free speech, until Bill C-10 passes I guess. However, the minister chose these people who are actively anti-oil and gas and put them on this group to tell him what to do in regard to policies relating to oil and gas.

We wanted to work with him on this advisory group and felt it could represent expertise in which Canadian industry excels. Instead, the minister would much rather reject industry entirely, so I for one have no interest in supporting his crusade or his legislation. It has become clear that the minister is completely focused on destroying Canada's oil and gas sector and all the people it employs.

Even knowing all that, we went into the committee process in good faith. I met with many groups from across the ideological spectrum, did a lot of research and worked to create productive and relevant amendments that would improve the bill. What did we find at committee? As many more people watch the House and committees, despite being wonderful entertainment, I will let those at home know what exactly occurred.

Government Orders

• (1340)

Initially, when the bill came to us at committee, all parties worked together to create a timeline for consideration that would have allowed enough time to hear witnesses, receive briefs and review the bill. However, when the committee next met, the Liberal members dropped a surprise motion to reverse all that had been agreed to in order to fast-track the bill and get it through as fast as possible. At the time, Conservatives warned that this schedule would make it difficult to properly conduct our important work, and how right we were.

The Liberals, with their NDP allies, were able to speed things up, so we started the study immediately. Witnesses were due the next day, so everyone had to scramble to do their best. Witness testimony was essentially limited to two days. We did hear some particularly good testimony from a variety of witnesses, yet on something clearly this important to the Liberals, why would they not want more evidence? It would become clear soon enough.

Many people do not know that when committees study a bill, there is a deadline to submit witnesses and amendments. As well, drafting amendments takes a couple of days. The incredibly hard-working staff, who assist in drafting these, are amazing to work with, but writing law takes time. The deadline for amendments in this sped-up Liberal-designed process was immediately after we heard the last witness testimony, so there was not much time to formulate ideas and get them ready. Even worse was how it affected the written submissions. This is what really gets me.

As soon as the bill got to committee, we put out a call for written briefs. These are quite common: Generally experts or interested Canadians send in their opinions on a piece of legislation. They are an essential aspect in ensuring that Canadians can feel included in the process and feel heard. I spoke to witnesses who, when invited to the committee, were told the deadline for submitting a brief was the day they were invited. These briefs are often technical and professionally researched articles. How is an expert supposed to write a submission with literally zero days' notice? The answer is they cannot.

Additionally, as we are a bilingual nation, all of the submissions had to be collected and translated before being sent to members of the public. All of this led to the farce that we saw at the environment committee on the study of Bill C-12. When amendments were due on a Friday before we started clause-by-clause review, only a small number of briefs were available to members. The next week, there were dozens of briefs. Over 70 were posted and then made available. That means that due to the Liberals' single-minded focus on passing the bill as fast as they could and limiting the witness testimony as much as they could, the vast majority of public opinion on the bill was not available until after amendments were due. This is a completely disrespectful act conducted by the Liberals and their allies in the NDP to ignore public opinion.

Ontario Power Generation, Fertilizer Canada, the Canadian Union of Postal Workers, the Canadian Nuclear Association and the Canadian Electricity Association all sent briefs after amendments were due. Even environmental groups were hurt by this. The briefs from Ecojustice, Citizens' Climate Lobby, Leadnow, the David

Suzuki Foundation and the previously mentioned Climate Action Network all were not available until after amendments were due.

Perhaps the most egregious impact of the Liberals' behaviour on this bill is that no indigenous witnesses were heard from during the study. As far for the course, the brief from the Assembly of First Nations, as I am sure everyone has guessed, was available only after amendments were due.

Additionally, there were a great many briefs from individual Canadians who worked hard to have their voices heard. Thanks to the Liberals, they feel ignored. I heard from one Canadian who said she worked hard on her brief and was excited to have her voice heard, yet when she learned that amendments were due before her brief could even be read, she was totally disenchanted with the process. Our responsibility as elected officials is to ensure that Canadians feel heard, feel included and feel a part of something. What the Liberals and their NDP allies did during this process is disgraceful, and it is a terrible mark on the history of this place.

• (1345)

Now I will get to the clause-by-clause study itself. Despite all I said, we still went in with productive amendments and hoped for the best. Indeed, the minister said he was willing to work with all parties to make the bill better. Again, that turned out not to be true. It became clear very quickly that, instead of there being a willingness to debate or even engage on good ideas, the fix was in. The Liberals and the NDP made a deal to approve their own amendments and reject everyone else's, no matter how reasoned or reasonable.

• (1350)

[*Translation*]

Before I get to our proposed amendments, I just want to share an example that shows how ridiculous the whole process was. At one point during the study, the Green Party proposed an amendment that was identical to a government amendment. The Green Party's amendment came up first, and the Liberal and NDP members opposed it even though it was exactly the same as their own amendment.

It is clear that their strategy was to reject literally every other suggestion, regardless of what it was. For context, the amendment in question would have required emissions targets to be set 10 years in advance.

People who are familiar with the workings of Parliament and committees can probably guess what happened next. If an amendment is rejected, any subsequent amendment that says the same thing is automatically removed from the list because the committee has already expressed its will on the matter. The Liberals and New Democrats are so staunchly opposed to any amendment other than their own that they ended up killing one of their own amendments.

What followed was an absurd exchange during which the member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley proposed a new amendment that would require targets to be set 9 years and 366 days beforehand, instead of 10 years. I am not giving this example to poke fun at the Liberals and the New Democrats, even if it was funny, but because it shows to what extent they were reluctant to consider changes that were not theirs.

What were some of the reasonable changes we proposed? I think Canadians would like to know.

First, we think that solving the very real problem of climate change must be done through a whole-of-government approach. The federal government is famous for operating in silos. One group or department that is responsible for a problem or a particular issue does not usually work with others, or does not coordinate with them. I am sure anyone who has worked in Ottawa or for the federal government has many stories about this. That cannot happen when it comes to tackling climate change. Everyone must work together.

Of course, Environment and Climate Change Canada is the key department, but it also needs to coordinate with the departments of industry, finance, natural resources, employment, crown-indigenous relations and many others. We therefore proposed a series of straightforward amendments to remove the powers to set targets, create plans and approve reports from the Minister of Environment alone and include the entire cabinet. The Minister of Environment would recommend policy to cabinet, but cabinet would ultimately decide how to move forward. This is not exactly reinventing the wheel.

That is generally how policy is made in government: Silos are broken down as much as possible and other departments are included.

Perhaps the Minister of Environment did not consider the impact on industry, jobs and indigenous peoples. Bringing together cabinet to make decisions about these objectives and plans is the right thing to do. Unfortunately, the Liberals and the NDP even refused to debate, and they rejected every amendment we proposed for that purpose.

In their dream world, the Minister of Environment and Climate Change is an omnipotent figure who dictates every policy by decree. That is not how the Conservatives want to manage things. We believe in collaboration and the importance of working together, especially on the issue of climate change.

Another set of amendments that we proposed would have added that, when objectives were set or plans formulated, the minister would be required to balance social and economic factors, including the impact on employment and national unity. Climate change is real, and we absolutely need everyone to work hard to address it.

We cannot accomplish this by blowing the top off Canadian industry and the well-paying jobs that support Canadian families. We need to look at the big picture and make decisions that will improve the lives of all Canadians. That includes Canadians in the regions that will be most affected by these policies. Our country is stronger together, and we must do all we can to keep it that way. A government that is bent on destroying a region's main industry is not a

government that knows how to build a nation. Therefore, it seems to me that examining how these policies will impact these factors would be a good idea.

However, the Liberals and the New Democrats refused to so much as debate the subject and rejected all the amendments, which, frankly, surprised me. The government loves to talk about how the green economy will create so many jobs. If that were true, our amendment would allow the government to brag about it, would it not? Instead, they rejected it. Why? Because it came from the Conservatives.

We then suggested that the progress report include the greenhouse gas emissions and sequestration from non-anthropogenic or non-human factors. This would include the amounts sequestered by our vast unmanaged forests and prairies and emissions from such things as forest fires and methane releases from melting permafrost. I personally feel that we cannot make a plan unless we have the full picture. Canadians often ask me what impact our forests have on emissions. Although this information is available in some places, it would be much easier for Canadians to have access to it in the main reports. Again, this seems like an obvious thing to include, but the Liberals and the NDP voted against it without debate.

After that, we proposed another great addition. As people know, Canada is a federation, and the provincial governments control many of the policy levers that are needed to achieve our climate goals. They manage the resource sector, the electrical grid and the building code.

● (1355)

We wanted the assessment reports to include a summary of the measures taken by the provincial governments to achieve the national greenhouse gas emissions targets.

Again—

● (1400)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Order. The hon. member will be able to finish his speech after question period.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

RETIREMENT CONGRATULATIONS

Mr. Tony Van Bynen (Newmarket—Aurora, Lib.): Madam Speaker, for over 27 years, Rae Bowie has dedicated her career to public service and helping Canadians. Over the years, Rae has worked for many members of Parliament, at both the provincial and the federal levels. She has mentored numerous staff and provided outstanding service to constituents in several ridings.

Statements by Members

Rae has also been an exemplary community member through her volunteer service across York Region, a friend to all of us, and a proud mother and grandmother. Her support for the residents of Newmarket—Aurora throughout this pandemic has not been unnoticed.

Rae has been an invaluable team member and we will miss her. On behalf of our team and all of those who have had the pleasure to work with her, congratulations to Rae on her well-deserved retirement.

* * *

COVID-19 VACCINES

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan (Calgary Forest Lawn, CPC): Madam Speaker, today as we celebrate National Indigenous Peoples Day, I would like to recognize the Siksika nation's generous donation of vaccines to the Dashmesh Culture Centre in Calgary for their vaccine drive. Through the tireless efforts led by President Amanpreet Singh Gill and the entire executive committee, the Dashmesh Culture Centre serves the community at large in Calgary through Seva and many community initiatives. This is what Canada is about.

When the South Asian community needed help to tackle COVID-19, it was our indigenous brothers and sisters who stood up and came to help. During this pandemic, we must remember that we are in this together. As Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. once said, "Somewhere along the way, we must learn that there is nothing greater than to do something for others."

We are stronger together and may God truly keep this beautiful land strong and free.

* * *

WITHROW PARK FARMERS' MARKET

Ms. Julie Dabrusin (Toronto—Danforth, Lib.): Madam Speaker, this year, the Withrow Park Farmers' Market celebrates its 15th anniversary. Started as a pilot project, it came together through the hard work and dedication of volunteers. Roberta was at the heart of it all. She could be found every Saturday at the market and working throughout the week to make it a success.

The market is not just about food; it is about projects like its zero-waste initiative, which moved people beyond single-use plastics by lending out plates, cups and cutlery to use for market foods, and it is about building community. I used to organize a stone soup at the fire pit. Community members would pick food up at the market and together we would make a big pot of soup to share while telling stories around the fire.

My thanks to Chantal, the market manager; Eleanor, Janet, Lanrick, Estelle and Mary on the board of directors; and all of the amazing volunteers who make the Withrow Park Farmers' Market a great part of our community.

[*Translation*]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille (Salaberry—Suroît, BQ): Madam Speaker, at this very moment, seriously ill people are facing unacceptable financial worries. They are wondering whether they will be able to provide for their families while they are recovering. They are caught in this dilemma because employment insurance is failing them in the middle of their recovery, when what they need is 50 weeks of special sickness benefits.

Bill C-265 received unanimous support from the members of the parliamentary committee. People who are sick need compassion and caring, not to be abandoned. That is why the House is calling for an increase in EI sickness benefits to 50 weeks.

The only thing missing is for the Liberal government to give the royal recommendation to the bill. The time has come to listen to the will of parliamentarians and give the royal recommendation to the *Émilie Sansfaçon* bill, to ensure that sick workers are never again abandoned.

* * *

● (1405)

MEDAL AWARDED BY MP FOR BOURASSA

Mr. Emmanuel Dubourg (Bourassa, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as part of the third "eminent men in Bourassa" ceremony, which was held in Bourassa, I had the honour of celebrating six men, who lead various organizations, for their significant contributions to making our riding a better place to live.

At this ceremony, held on Father's Day, I handed out certificates to these men and awarded them the Bourassa MP's medal for distinguished service. The recipients are François Bérard, Antonio Bernabei, Omar Messiou, Will Prosper, Martin Rodrigue and José Trottier.

It is important to point out the accomplishments of these men in the riding of Bourassa and to present them to my colleagues in the House of Commons.

* * *

[*English*]

BARRIE—INNISFIL

Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC): Mr. Speaker, close to 200 well-wishers lined the streets leading to the home of Edwin Ng as he returned home earlier this month.

Ng, a 48-year-old husband, father, grandfather and dedicated personal support worker, contracted COVID-19 when an outbreak devastated Roberta Place long-term care centre in January. He spent almost five months in hospital and underwent a double lung transplant. He was determined to survive and with support from his wife Samantha, family, friends and community and their faith in God, Edwin never gave up hope.

Statements by Members

Our community of Barrie—Innisfil is also sending its love and support to Troy Scott, owner of the Foodland in Stroud, who was recently hospitalized facing a similar battle as Edwin did after contracting COVID. In Barrie—Innisfil and communities across Canada, our resiliency, and in many cases our faith, has been tested with stories like Edwin's and Troy's.

As we approach Canada Day inspired by these stories of resilience, let them serve as a reminder that as a nation, Canada has faced and overcome great challenges during our history when we are united, determined, compassionate and respectful, and we will do so again.

* * *

HOUSING

Mr. Wayne Long (Saint John—Rothesay, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since 2015, I have been advocating for more affordable housing for my riding of Saint John—Rothesay. Housing is a basic human right that should be available to all. That is why, for the fifth consecutive budget, we are making significant new investments in housing.

Budget 2021 proposes an additional \$2.5 billion over seven years in new funding. Notably, we are extending the highly successful rapid housing initiative introduced by our government late last year, with an additional investment of \$1.5 billion in 2021-22. Last week, I had the pleasure of being joined by Minister Hussen to announce a \$1.3-million investment from the federal government to build the Unified Saint John Housing Co-operative's Victoria Street building, which includes 14 housing units primarily intended for low-income women, including women with children.

I want to thank all of those involved in this project for all of their hard work and their commitment to providing safe and affordable housing for those who need it most.

The Speaker: I just want to remind hon. members that even during their S.O. 31, they cannot mention the name of someone in the chamber. Normally, we refer to them by their position or their riding.

On another note, I just want to offer a tip that has worked for me. I saw it happen to a member earlier. Always have a hard copy of whatever your statement is, even if you are using the screen. It just works out that much better as a backup.

The hon. member for Niagara Centre.

* * *

YEAR OF THE GARDEN

Mr. Vance Badawey (Niagara Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, gardens and gardening contribute to the development of our country and our cities, as well as to the lives of Canadians in terms of health, quality of life, reconciliation, inclusion and environmental challenges.

We recognize 2022 as Canada's Year of the Garden, marking the centennial of Canada's ornamental horticulture sector on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the Canadian Nursery Landscape Association. The Year of the Garden, led by the Canadian Garden Council, will engage Canadian gardeners, families, students and tourists with our garden culture and history, the importance of pub-

lic and private gardens, and our urban landscapes. It will invite Canadians to "live the garden life".

The Year of the Garden 2022 will also contribute to the economic development of municipalities across this great nation. Members of all political parties have expressed support for the Year of the Garden 2022, along with members of Canada's garden family from all parts of this great country. Canada is also the first country to celebrate the Year of the Garden.

* * *

● (1410)

HENRY FLECK

Mr. Blaine Calkins (Red Deer—Lacombe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Ponoka lost a legend earlier this year when Mr. Henry Fleck passed away on January 22. A cowboy to the core, Henry had a love for all things horse-drawn and was best known as a stagecoach driver in the grand entry of the Ponoka Stampede, a role he held for more than 15 years.

No doubt about it, Henry was a cowboy through and through and shared his passion with everyone. If he was not driving the stagecoach in the summer, he was pulling a sleigh in the winter. He rarely asked for money; just a little something to cover the cost of feeding the horses. When the occasion called, Henry would honour fallen cowboys by bringing them to their final resting place in a horse-drawn hearse.

Henry was proud to be from Central Alberta and would often tour with the stagecoach to other destinations to promote his hometown and the Ponoka Stampede, and to bring a sample of our western hospitality to everyone. We were so blessed to have such an incredible ambassador for the cowboy way of life in our midst.

Rest easy, Henry. We tip our hats to you.

* * *

[Translation]

SHOP LOCAL

Ms. Rachel Bendayan (Outremont, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, small neighbourhood businesses across the country are reopening, and the federal government is here to support them, as it has been from the first day of the pandemic.

After working with the Minister of Small Business for several months, I was present for the announcement of our national shop local program this morning. The federal government is working with chambers of commerce across the country, including the Fédération des chambres de commerce du Québec, to promote our main streets.

*Statements by Members**[English]*

Small businesses are reopening across the country, and they need us. They need all Canadians to think of them and support them through their recovery.

Earlier today, the Minister of Small Business and I announced a new federal program that will support “shop local” initiatives right across the country and encourage all Canadians to support their local entrepreneurs.

Tens of millions of dollars in federal funding are coming to our main streets, because our local small businesses and our neighbourhood merchants are what make our communities home. So get out there and shop local.

* * *

LEEDS—GRENVILLE—THOUSAND ISLANDS AND RIDEAU LAKES

Mr. Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the people of Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes have been getting things done. Collaborating with the provincial and municipal governments, our community has been working together to bring federal funding for major projects we need in developing them from ideas into reality.

There are massive infrastructure projects, like the County Road 43 expansion that will get us to work in the morning and home at night more safely; recreation projects, like the new arena in Prescott that will serve as a community hub; or affordable housing projects, like the St. Vincent de Paul project in Brockville with affordable housing for seniors. I will continue to fight to make sure that our community gets its fair share of dollars for these vital projects.

We are going to call on the government for more funds for investment in Gananoque, Westport, Rideau Lakes, North Grenville and across the United Counties, with rec projects in Leeds and the Thousand Islands and Edwardsburgh Cardinal.

I want to thank my provincial and municipal counterparts and everyone in our community who has worked so hard on these projects. Together, we are building a better community.

* * *

ATTACK IN LONDON, ONTARIO

Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the anti-Muslim terrorist attack in London, Ontario, which took the lives of four members of the Afzaal family devastated our nation, including my community of Oshawa and Durham Region.

On Friday, June 11, councillor Maleeha Shahid and Siraj Patel organized a peace walk and vigil to remember the lives lost, mourn for Fayeze, a boy now left without his family, and to take a stand against the hate that brought destruction to innocent Canadians just trying to live their lives. I want to thank Imam Shakir and Pastor Jayson Levy for their words of comfort and challenge that evening.

I was also thankful for the opportunity to visit the Islamic Centre of Oshawa this past Friday to speak with the imam and the congrega-

tion. The intense pain felt by those in London is shared in Oshawa.

Oshawa has a strong history of celebrating our multicultural past, and we are committed to welcoming all cultures as part of our rich, shared and respected future.

* * *

● (1415)

NATIONAL INDIGENOUS PEOPLES DAY

Ms. Mumilaaq Qaqqaq (Nunavut, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today is National Indigenous Peoples Day. It should be a day of celebration, culture and history, but I am filled with a tremendous amount of sadness and anger.

When this institution talks about indigenous communities, we often talk about resiliency. Those in the federal institution talk about record-breaking investments when a quarter to five dollars is a slap in the face. They pat themselves on the back while denying Inuit access to safe, livable space that keeps them alive.

I will continue to say this. There is no reason to be proud of for indigenous peoples in this institution. There is nothing for anyone to be patting themselves on the back. In fact, they should all feel extreme shame. I feel ashamed that Inuit are continuously being denied the right to live, the right to self-determination.

Today, I applaud Inuit and indigenous peoples. Without ourselves, our strength and our resilience, we would not be here.

Matna.

* * *

*[Translation]***NATIONAL INDIGENOUS PEOPLES DAY**

Ms. Sylvie Bérubé (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, BQ): Mr. Speaker, today is National Indigenous Peoples Day, but commemorations are not enough, especially after what happened in Kamloops. This day must be one of action and must focus on respectful nation-to-nation collaboration, in spite of the gravity of residential schools. That is why the Bloc Québécois spoke to the different assemblies representing the first nations and the Inuit.

As a result of these discussions, we are calling on the government to contribute financial resources to identify the locations that may have been the site of the same horrors as in Kamloops. We are calling on the government to push the religious communities that participated in the residential school system to give access to their archives. Furthermore, we are demanding that a monument for residential schools be constructed in Ottawa, in collaboration with the Algonquin nation.

*Oral Questions***ORAL QUESTIONS**

These actions will not erase the generations of violence, inhumanity and shame, but they do represent a step forward. This is what indigenous peoples are recommending and what we must do together.

* * *

*[English]***CONSERVATIVE PARTY OF CANADA**

Ms. Jag Sahota (Calgary Skyview, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this pandemic has wreaked havoc on our economy and resulted in thousands of individuals being laid off, with the vast majority of those affected being women.

While Canadian women have been struggling to make ends meet, the Liberal government, under this Prime Minister, decided to dole out millions to his rich friends and raise taxes on middle-class Canadians. Canadian women cannot afford this corruption and these higher taxes any longer.

However, there is hope for women. Canada's Conservatives have a five-point plan to secure the future for Canadians, which includes recovering the million jobs lost, balancing the budget over the next decade and bringing about more accountability so we never see another WE scandal.

For those who support higher taxes, job losses and more scandals, Canadians have four parties to choose from, the Liberals, Bloc, NDP and Greens, but for Canadian women who care about securing Canada's economic future, there is only one choice: Canada's Conservatives.

* * *

NATIONAL INDIGENOUS PEOPLES DAY

Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today we honour the rich cultures and traditions of first nations, Inuit and Métis across Canada. We also recognize this National Indigenous Peoples Day is occurring at a time that is very difficult. Many of us are deeply heartbroken on learning of the unmarked remains of children at the former residential school near Kamloops.

This National Indigenous History Month is dedicated to the missing children who went to residential school and never came home. It is dedicated to their families and to all residential school survivors.

While today we recognize the historic and ongoing contributions of indigenous people to our country, we also take the time to educate ourselves about the hard truths of our past. We acknowledge the ongoing impacts of racist colonial policies and the realities of current systemic racism.

We encourage all Canadians to read or reread the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's calls to action, as they are a road map to reconciliation, a road map that is supported by indigenous people, by our government and hopefully by all Canadians.

● (1420)

*[English]***ETHICS**

Hon. Candice Bergen (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today we learned that 149 Liberal MPs have been using taxpayer dollars to pay the Prime Minister's good buddy, Tom Pitfield, to help Liberals get elected. Mr. Pitfield is not just the Prime Minister's friend; his wife was the president of the Liberal Party, and they both were with the Prime Minister on that infamous billionaire island trip. It is just a typical day in the life of the corrupt Liberals.

Who instructed Liberal MPs to use their taxpayer-funded budgets to pay the Prime Minister's friend to do political campaign work?

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government believes strongly in the work that all members do for their constituents. It is very important work, and Canadians need to know their MPs are advocating for them. They also need to know that MPs have the ability to keep up with all the files of the people they represent.

The technology that has been raised here today is used by our MPs to help manage their constituency casework. Canadians are being served well by their MPs through this system.

Hon. Candice Bergen (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, well, Liberal friends are certainly being served well: \$200,000 for Katie Telford and Gerald Butts's moving expenses, half a billion dollars for the Prime Minister's friends at the WE Charity and now tens of thousands of taxpayer dollars for another one of the Prime Minister's buddies.

It pays very well to be a friend of the corrupt Prime Minister, but Canadians cannot afford more of this unethical behaviour. Again, who in the government told 149 Liberal MPs to give taxpayer money to Tom Pitfield, the Prime Minister's friend and colleague?

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what Canadians cannot afford anymore is this blockage from the Conservatives. We have very important bills ahead of us in Parliament that need to be voted on, and the Conservatives are trying to shut down Parliament. They have been filibustering. They did not want to add additional hours so that we can work. We are here ready to work for all Canadians. The Conservatives should stop playing their games and support us to support Canadians.

*Oral Questions***PUBLIC SAFETY**

Hon. Candice Bergen (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let us talk about the important work of Parliament. In less than one hour, the president of the Public Health Agency of Canada will appear before the bar of the House of Commons. This Parliament, this one, has asked four times to see the documents relating to the firing of two scientists from the National Microbiology Lab. Now the agency has been found in contempt of Parliament for failing to hand the documents over.

Will the government confirm that it will stop the cover-up today and allow the president of PHAC to table the unredacted documents to this, the people's House?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is disappointing to see the opposition play games with Canadians' national security. The member knows full well that unredacted documents were provided to an appropriate committee of parliamentarians who have the expertise and clearance to review documents that are sensitive in nature. We will never put Canadians' national security at risk, and I really hope the member opposite understands why that is important.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the important thing is that we respect our institutions.

In less than an hour, the president of the Public Health Agency of Canada should be here in the House to table documents regarding what happened at the Winnipeg lab. It is an order of the House, not a wish or desire. In one hour, we will see whether the Government of Canada respects our institutions and the will of the House of Commons.

Will the government allow the Public Health Agency to table the documents that Canadians want to see so that they can understand what happened in Winnipeg?

[*English*]

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the member opposite does not respect institutions, nor does the member opposite respect national security. Do not take it from me. Take it from Thomas Juneau, an associate professor at the University of Ottawa. He said, "This is a big setback for the parliamentary oversight of intelligence in Canada and, more broadly, for efforts to improve transparency and accountability." The Conservatives are playing a dangerous game and they know it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what is dangerous and despicable is to disregard the orders of the House.

Experts may not know that, but the minister should. The documents that we have requested will be tabled here with the Clerk. The Clerk will do his duty as a Canadian and a responsible man. He will review the documents, strike out any sensitive information and present the documents to parliamentarians. That is our job as responsible MPs.

Why does the government want to play petty politics by toying with national security and disregarding the House?

• (1425)

[*English*]

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again, the member opposite knows that those unredacted documents have been provided to a committee of parliamentarians that has the appropriate oversight to look at them in a safe way that protects Canadians' national security.

However, why take it from me? Let us listen to Stephanie Carvin, a professor at Carleton University. She said, "This bulldozer approach to national security is misguided, dangerous", and there is that word again, "and will result in a less transparent system overall."

* * *

[*Translation*]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Alain Therrien (La Prairie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, EI was one of the greatest failures of the pandemic. The program is so ineffective that the federal government had to invent the Canada emergency response benefit to keep millions of families from ending up on the streets. Particularly hard hit were arts and culture workers, many of them self-employed.

Last week, the Government of Quebec wrote to the federal government, urging it to ensure that the employment insurance reform takes into account the unique status of artists and cultural workers.

Will the government work with Quebec to reform EI so that it provides decent coverage to self-employed workers, especially those in arts and culture?

Hon. Carla Qualtrough (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Disability Inclusion, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes. We are keeping our promise to modernize the employment insurance program. We are making a historic investment in targeted consultations with Canadians, employers and stakeholders. The concerns the Government of Quebec raised in its letter dovetail with what we are trying to do, which is work with the provinces, stakeholders and experts. We will keep working to modernize EI so that all employees have access to it.

Mr. Alain Therrien (La Prairie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am all for reopening, but we must not forget that the economic recovery will not help cultural sector workers this summer. They will not be able to sell out concert halls or tour festivals this summer. They were the first ones to be laid off and they will be among the last ones to return to work at the very end of the pandemic. They are falling through the cracks, and their situation is urgent.

Employment insurance has never been there for them and, today, despite the emergency measures, they will be cut off from the Canadian recovery benefit. This is an urgent matter.

Will the government help businesses in the cultural sector and their employees?

[English]

Hon. Carla Qualtrough (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Disability Inclusion, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of this pandemic, that is exactly the kind of worker we have been trying to help, whether it be through the CERB or through the CRB.

Bill C-30 has measures in it that will extend the CRB, that will help out businesses and that will help out employers who want to retain their employees. What we can do, as a Parliament, for this country, is support Bill C-30, get money to workers and get money to business so that we can all get through this pandemic.

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as the number of indigenous children found in unmarked graves in Canada rises, the government is continuing to retraumatize indigenous families.

A human rights tribunal found that the government discriminated against first nations kids, and instead of making it right, the government keeps fighting these kids in court. This is not a collaborative process. The government is taking indigenous kids to court.

Since the last time I asked the minister about this, the government has been in court for another week, so I will ask this again: When will the government stop fighting first nations kids in court?

Hon. Marc Miller (Minister of Indigenous Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is important to be clear to all Canadians and Parliament that as part of this process, not a single child has had to testify.

There are competing class actions that require us to look at this process as a whole. We are currently in confidential discussions with parties, and those will remain confidential.

Let me be clear once again that every single first nation child who has been discriminated against by the broken child welfare system will be fairly, justly and equitably compensated.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Ms. Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this weekend, Black Lives Matter Toronto organized the first national gathering of Black and indigenous families affected by police violence. Families stood outside the Prime Minister's Office demanding action regarding Anthony Aust, Jamal Francique, Regis Korchinski-Paquet, Rodney Levi, Abdirahman Abdi, Eishia Hudson, Andrew Loku, Jermaine Carby, Chantelle Krupka and Chantel Moore.

When will the Prime Minister heed the calls from these families and end police state violence against the bodies of Black and indigenous people and people of colour?

• (1430)

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Minister of Diversity and Inclusion and Youth, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we take these calls to action very seriously. We know that the pandemic has impacted all Canadians, and disproportionately certain segments.

Oral Questions

We know that systemic racism exists within our institutions. That is why, in budget 2021, we see numerous measures to address a lot of this important work. It is important that we pass this legislation, and it is really unfortunate that political games are being played.

We recognize that every department and agency and every minister has a role to play. We take this work seriously. That is why we are working closely with the anti-racism secretariat. I look forward to working with the member.

ETHICS

Mr. Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when asked why 97% of Liberal MP offices were paying Tom Pitfield, the childhood friend of the Prime Minister and fellow vacationer to billionaire island, the Liberal member for Scarborough—Guildwood said, “I haven't got a clue. I can't explain it. I vaguely recall once a year we write a cheque and it's always been explained that it is within the ethical guidelines, so we all kind of sign up for it and it goes into some oblivion.” Yikes.

Who in the government told these Liberal MPs to sign taxpayer dollars into oblivion?

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I explained earlier, our government believes strongly in the work that all members do for their constituents. It is extremely important work, and Canadians need to know that their MPs are advocating for them. They also need to know that MPs have the ability to keep up with all the files of the people they represent.

The technology we are discussing here is used for MPs to help manage their constituency casework. Canadians are being served well by their MPs through the system.

Mr. Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government House leader said that it is no big deal, so I guess we better take his word for it, just as those Liberal MPs should take the word of the Prime Minister and this cabinet, who have been found guilty of multiple ethical law breaches, that there are no ethical misdeeds happening here.

Tom Pitfield is a close friend of the Prime Minister. This is another Liberal insider getting ahead on the backs of hard-working Canadians.

Oral Questions

Who in the government told these Liberal MPs to cut a cheque to the Prime Minister's friend Tom Pitfield?

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is a bit rich coming from that member, who tried to shut down Parliament not too long ago. The Conservatives have tried to change channels here, but what is happening at the moment is that we are trying to work for Canadians. We are trying to adopt bills that are extremely important, including the budget, which has elements that are extremely important to Canadians.

What are the Conservatives doing? They are blocking, filibustering and wasting the time of the House. It is time for them to stop their games and support this work for all Canadians.

Mr. Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what is rich is hearing the government House leader, who sits on the side of the most corrupt government in this country's history, talk about shutdowns. The Liberals prorogued the House during a pandemic, filibustered dozens of hours across multiple committees and mismanaged the House agenda so badly that they find themselves unable to get what they deem to be key legislation passed at the end of the parliamentary session. He should be ashamed of this, just as he should be ashamed of how the Liberals are misappropriating taxpayer dollars to subsidize Liberal political operations.

The Liberal minister needs to tell us whether he was complicit. Was he the one who gave the order for 97% of the Liberal caucus to misappropriate taxpayer dollars?

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member should be ashamed. He got up a couple of weeks ago on a Thursday morning around 10 a.m., when people go to work, and said the Conservatives had worked enough and they were going to stop and go back home. There is no way. We are here to work for Canadians.

The Conservatives want to talk about proroguing. They are the international champions of proroguing, and they had no reason in their case. They should stop blocking us and should work with us for the benefit of all Canadians.

[Translation]

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is clear that it pays to be a member of the Liberal Prime Minister's inner circle. Do my colleagues know Tom Pitfield, a very old friend of the Prime Minister's? Mr. Pitfield is also the owner of Data Sciences, a business that offers technical support for the Liberalist, the partisan scoring list of the Liberal Party.

We learned today that 97% of Liberal members, or 149 of them, used their constituency budgets to pay for Data Sciences' services. Who asked Liberal members to pay for the services of the Prime Minister's friend?

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have already explained, the technology that has been raised here is used by MPs to help manage their constituency casework. That is all.

I find it a little odd that the Conservatives are trying to change the channel right now, because what is going on is shameful. They

are blocking bills that are absolutely critical. Benefits for several programs will end in nine days if the budget does not pass, but what are the Conservatives doing? They keep blocking our work. It is time for them to stop doing that and start working with us for the benefit of all Canadians.

• (1435)

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let me explain to the government House leader why this issue is so sensitive. Rather than tell the truth, two Liberal members said they did not know why they were paying Data Sciences with parliamentary resources. The Liberals are writing cheques to a friend of the Prime Minister without knowing why. That is what is really going on.

We only recently learned about these partisan payments to Data Sciences, but Mr. Pitfield has been in charge of the Liberals' digital operations since 2015, and he will likely take on the same role for the next election. Can the Prime Minister tell us how much money his good friend has received from parliamentary offices since 2015?

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, can my colleague tell me when the Conservatives will stop blocking the budget? Can he tell me when they will stop blocking Bill C-10 so we can get the web giants to start contributing? When will they stop blocking Bill C-12 so that we can continue working for the future of our children and grandchildren? When will they stop blocking Bill C-6, on a process that harms our youth and the LGBTQ+ community?

When will they stop blocking these progressive bills, and when will the Bloc Québécois and the NDP stop supporting the Conservatives' antics and start helping us and all Canadians?

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals did not add Bill C-6 to the agenda for four months, and they spent 183 hours filibustering in committee. The Leader of the Government is the one who is unable to manage the House. That is the reality.

The member for Malpeque told The Globe and Mail that the Liberal Party gathers partisan information from constituency offices. He said that MPs have to be careful in how they handle the system, to avoid misusing the information for partisan gain.

To sum up, the Prime Minister has a good friend who travelled with him to the Aga Khan's island and a close friend who runs the partisan Liberalist with money paid out of the public budgets of 149 MPs. He is asking Canadians to believe that no rules were broken. Who ordered the payments?

Oral Questions

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, who on the other side is instructing members to block everything the government is doing? Who on the other side is instructing members to block funding for the wage subsidy, the rent relief and the assistance for people who lost their jobs? Who in the opposition is instructing members to block the bill that would help our cultural sector and our artists who are struggling right now? I would like to know who over there is giving these instructions.

* * *

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Ms. Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, I asked the Minister of Official Languages why she was opposed to the Charter of the French Language applying to all Quebecers.

Her answer speaks volumes, and I want to quote her directly. "For the first time ever, the federal government is stepping up and protecting the French language." That is a pretty big admission.

I have a suggestion for the minister. Why would the federal government not, for the first time in history, let Quebec choose its own language regime?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Economic Development and Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague can keep asking me questions, which I will always be pleased to answer because doing so gives me an opportunity to talk about the government's position.

Basically, we want to protect the French language. We are recognizing new rights: the right to work in French and to be served in French in federally regulated businesses.

My colleague should be happy about that. For years, for decades even, for 30 years to be exact, the Bloc Québécois has been demanding greater protection for French. That is what the Liberal government is doing. Let us celebrate that fact together and get to work.

Ms. Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, what the government could do for the first time in history is respect the Charter of the French Language. For the first time in history, the government could recognize that Quebec should be in charge of deciding matters related to the French language in Quebec. For the first time in history, the federal government could fulfill its responsibilities and protect French by allowing Quebec to fulfill its responsibilities and protect French.

Will the Minister of Official Languages respect the will of Quebec for the first time in history?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Economic Development and Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague must be wondering what place the Bloc Québécois has in the House of Commons. The Bloc Québécois has been calling for greater protection for French for decades.

Our government keeps its promises and protects the French language. Obviously, the Bloc Québécois's objective is to always bicker with the federal government and find points of contention to advance its sovereignist agenda and defend the separatist cause.

However, that is not working, because Quebecers want us to protect French within a united Canada where we care about their concerns and create opportunities for them.

• (1440)

Ms. Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, contrary to what the minister would have us believe, it is not true that the bill she introduced does more to protect French in Quebec. It is full of grandfather clauses and exceptions. It does, however, contain some good things for francophone minority communities, which I applaud her for, because that was needed.

However, for Quebec, this bill is clearly not equivalent to Bill 101. The minister says that she really wants to protect French in Quebec. If that is true, can she justify why her party is the only one that is refusing to support our bill to subject federally regulated businesses to the Charter of the French Language?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Economic Development and Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois is fearmongering once again. Basically, if my colleague read the bill we introduced very carefully, she would know that we are willing to recognize the application of the Charter of the French Language to federally regulated businesses that have already signed up and to those who wish to do so and be subject to it.

Now, we want to fill the legal void. We do not want the right to work or to be served in French to be denied. Therefore, we are also creating our own federal approach, which will help strengthen the French language in Quebec, as well as in regions with a strong francophone presence.

This is good news. Let us celebrate together.

* * *

[English]

THE ECONOMY

Mr. James Cumming (Edmonton Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government introduced its budget with limited targets, and one of the few measurements was the declaration on chart 35 that one million jobs would be recovered by the end of June. The fact is that between March and May of this year, our economy lost jobs. We have the second-highest unemployment rate of all the G7, and inflation is running rampant.

Will the Prime Minister deliver on his promise of one million jobs recovered by the end of June?

Oral Questions

Mr. Sean Fraser (Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and to the Minister of Middle Class Prosperity and Associate Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with respect, the hon. member seems not to appreciate the difference that our economy is experiencing in a positive way. This is the result of the measures we have put in place to support Canadian households and businesses through this pandemic. Yes, in order to protect lives from the threat of COVID-19, provincial governments put public health measures in place, including in Nova Scotia, which is reporting zero cases today. The reason we expect such a profound recovery is that we have supports designed to help businesses.

I am disappointed, however, that the Conservative member and his colleagues are obstructing the proceedings of Parliament to prevent these benefits from reaching businesses and workers. I am confident we will meet our target and exceed it in a timely way, so long as we have the measures in place to continue to support households and businesses through this pandemic.

Mr. James Cumming (Edmonton Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it appears that another promise made is a promise failed, when the government does not meet its benchmark of a return of creation of a million Canadian jobs by the end of this month. Between March and May, the unemployment rate rose from 7.5% to 8.2%. That is 1.6 million Canadians out of work. Jobs come from growth, and there is a lack of focus from the government on spending that would grow the economy.

Could the Prime Minister tell us today where the jobs went and the new date they will be coming back on?

Mr. Sean Fraser (Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and to the Minister of Middle Class Prosperity and Associate Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with respect, it is disappointing but not surprising to see the Conservatives take such glee in Canadians who were put out of work in order to protect the lives of their families and neighbours. The reality is that, yes, there has been a short-term hit to job numbers because provincial governments have restricted economic activity to save people's lives and preserve the long-term economic outlook for their provinces.

Nova Scotia is a prime example. It has recently rebounded from a lockdown with zero cases today. My only wish is that the Conservatives would stop obstructing the benefits that are designed to trigger growth and contribute to what is projected to be a profound—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Edmonton Centre.

Mr. James Cumming (Edmonton Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I can assure members I am not laughing. Jobs are not being created. The economy is not growing, and we are slipping in our G7 position. Canadians are desperate.

The Prime Minister sold this budget as a growth plan, but evidently it is nothing more than a marketing plan for an election. We cannot talk our way into a better future. My constituents are sick and tired of the lack of deliverables. They want action. I have had enough of the theatrics and the sales pitch of a budget.

Will the Prime Minister come forward with specific growth targets and clean, clear timelines by economic sector?

• (1445)

Mr. Sean Fraser (Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and to the Minister of Middle Class Prosperity and Associate Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member wants to compare us to our G7 counterparts, I would point him to the fact that we have a 64.6% labour force participation rate in Canada, compared to 61.6% in the United States. I would also point him to the fact that 80.9% of jobs have returned from peak job losses here, compared to 65.9% in the United States.

The reality is that we are seeing a relatively stronger economic rebound because we had relatively stronger public health measures put in place. I would point again to the example of Nova Scotia, which did see 22,000 jobs shut down last month, and it had previously had 100% of the economic activity return.

Today, my province is reporting zero cases, and we expect that to allow us to accelerate out of this pandemic recession. I only wish the Conservatives would get out of the way to allow these important measures, which target growth specifically, so the economy can come roaring back immediately.

* * *

[Translation]

GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have decided to cut the Canada recovery benefit at a time when thousands of businesses are still struggling to get back on their feet and entire sectors of our economy, such as the cultural sector and tourism, are still suffering.

What are the Liberals basing these cuts on? Did they conduct any studies or consult an expert panel? Are they reading tea leaves or prophesying from the actions of birds? All we are asking for is more than just lip service and platitudes. People deserve clear answers and transparency.

Why did the Liberals decide to cut support that people still desperately need?

[English]

Hon. Carla Qualtrough (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Disability Inclusion, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, from the beginning of the pandemic, our government has worked hard to keep Canadians healthy, safe and supported. Our emergency and recovery income support measures are helping buffer the worst economic impacts and continue to help Canadians put food on the table.

To continue supporting workers through this pandemic, we presented a plan in budget 2021 to extend the Canada recovery benefit up to 50 weeks and the Canada recovery caregiving benefit up to 42 weeks. We are also helping Canadians re-enter the labour market by creating 500,000 new training and work opportunities and launching the Canada recovery hiring benefit.

We are doing everything we can. We just need the support of every member in this House to get the support to Canadians that they need.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, there it is again. When the government talks about extending the Canada recovery benefit, it does not say what Canadians need to hear, and that is that it is cutting the amount of the support by 40%, from \$500 a week to \$300 a week. New Democrats have consistently opposed that cut.

I think the government at least owes Canadians the decency to hear out of the mouth of the minister that it is cutting that benefit, even as it extends it, by 40%.

Will the minister just fess up and put it on the record that the Liberals are cutting the benefit by 40%?

Hon. Carla Qualtrough (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Disability Inclusion, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the CRB is part of a comprehensive set of emergency and recovery measures to support Canadian workers. Through the CRB, Canadians can have access to up to 50 weeks of benefit.

Yes, the first 42 weeks are at \$500, and the last eight weeks are at \$300, but they also have access to more flexible EI benefits and access to the wage subsidy. All these other programs are in jeopardy if this House does not pass Bill C-30. That is what is at stake. Our entire recovery infrastructure is at stake if we do not get together and support Bill C-30.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Mr. Jaime Battiste (Sydney—Victoria, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in 2007, the Conservative government chose to vote against the adoption of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. In the years since, indigenous parliamentarians, including Romeo Saganash and I, among others, have worked diligently to rectify this mistake, resulting in our government's tabling and passing of Bill C-15.

On National Indigenous Peoples Day, could the Minister of Justice please update the House on Bill C-15 and the work ahead to implement UNDRIP?

Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Sydney—Victoria for his advocacy and effort in helping us to get to this momentous landmark. I would also like to salute and thank his father, Professor Sákéj Henderson, for all the work that he did in the development of the declaration.

The UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples passing in both chambers is an important step on the path toward reconciliation. It is not, however, the last one. The real work begins once the declaration is adopted. We will continue to work with indigenous

Oral Questions

peoples across Canada and support the co-development of an action plan to implement and achieve the objectives of the declaration.

We are building a better country for all our children and grandchildren.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Ms. Leona Alleslev (Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, a Toronto birthday party that should have been a celebration instead ended in tragedy. A one-year-old, a five-year-old and an 11-year-old were indiscriminately shot, caught in cross-fire. This shocking and outrageous act of gun violence against the precious lives of innocent children is devastating.

Violent gun offences are on the rise, increasingly because of illegal guns. The government has done nothing for six years. When will the minister act to protect Canadians and remove illegal guns from our communities?

● (1450)

Hon. Bill Blair (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I share the member's outrage about this terrible act of gun violence that took place in Toronto, in which innocent children were the victims. That is precisely why we have taken strong action to strengthen gun control, which is a different approach, whereas the Conservatives promised the gun lobby that they would weaken it.

We have prohibited a number of weapons designed for killing people, and we have brought forward strong, new legislation that will address all of the ways in which criminals gain access to guns. Additionally, we have made significant investments in policing and in communities. I would urge the member opposite to support those measures because communities and the police need our help.

Mr. Glen Motz (Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner, CPC): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the minister continues to mislead Canadians with that response. Under the Liberal government, gang violence continues to terrorize our communities, just like it did in Etobicoke this weekend. In Toronto, there have been over 160 shootings, with dozens injured or killed, in the last six months alone.

The Liberals' failed approach with Bill C-71, the gun ban, the confiscation plans and Bill C-21 focused on law-abiding firearms owners rather than illegal firearms and criminals. Instead of deceitful, tired talking points, when will the minister admit their plans are failing and put forward measures that actually protect Canadians?

Oral Questions

Hon. Bill Blair (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, the Conservatives are demonstrating their absolute commitment to weakened gun control and to keeping their promises to the gun lobby. The member referenced Bill C-71. The Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police deemed Bill C-71 as essential to public safety. In addition, we have introduced strong new legislation that would address all the ways in which criminals gain access to guns through smuggling, theft and criminal diversion.

We will strengthen gun control in the country and we will invest in policing and communities to keep our communities safe.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, if the media and the Conservative Party had not been so vigilant, the Prime Minister would have allowed the Chinese Communist Party to infiltrate our embassies around the world through the company Nuctech, which installed X-ray machines. We managed to convince him that it was a mistake, and he cancelled the contract.

However, the same company has installed the devices at our borders and airports. If they were not right for our embassies, will the Prime Minister finally realize that these devices need to be removed from our borders and airports?

[*English*]

Hon. Bill Blair (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me assure the member opposite that our border security officers remain extremely vigilant with respect to all national security concerns. They work very collaboratively with our national security intelligence agencies and law enforcement. We take their advice on all procurement decisions.

I have been assured that the devices that the member references pose no risk to Canadian national security, but we will remain vigilant.

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the minister knows that this is not true. The government knowingly installed security-compromised Nuctech equipment at our borders and airports. The operations committee's recommendations are clear: remove the Nuctech equipment from our airports and borders and ban the purchase of tech from Chinese state-owned companies.

Will the government act on this report to protect Canadians or will it instead continue to admire the basic Chinese dictatorship?

Hon. Bill Blair (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this gives me an opportunity to clarify that I have been assured by our border service officers that the use of this equipment in no way compromises Canadian interests or data, and that the devices are effective for the purposes for which they are used but do not pose a significant risk to public safety.

I want to also assure the member that we will continue to be vigilant. As I shared with the House back in December, we are well aware and have informed the House of the concerns that we have with respect to any opportunity for foreign interference from any hostile actor.

• (1455)

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Rhéal Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ): Mr. Speaker, when it comes to dealing with cases of sexual misconduct, the military justice system is a sad farce. Former Supreme Court justice Morris Fish says that the system allows high-ranking officers to interfere in the process. The former justice spoke about recommendations that were apparently rejected on the basis of arguments such as “it would hurt his career” or “we should give him another chance”. In short, the system protects abusers.

Justice Fish made 107 recommendations. Unfortunately, they will have to be implemented by the current Minister of Defence.

Is there anyone left in the House who believes that this will happen?

[*English*]

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are absolutely committed to making sure that we create a harassment-free workplace, free of absolute misconduct. I thank Justice Fish for the work he has done. We are accepting all the recommendations. In fact, we have actually started implementing 36 of the recommendations.

We will also be working alongside Madame Justice Arbour on the next steps as well.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rhéal Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ): Mr. Speaker, if the government is that determined to change the culture of sexual misconduct in the military, it is going to have to explain itself.

For the past month, the Liberals have been filibustering at the Standing Committee on National Defence to avoid having to release the committee's report on sexual misconduct to the House. Right now, we do not even know if there will be a report in the end.

My question is for the Liberal member who chairs the Standing Committee on National Defence.

When will she stop allowing the committee to keep victims of sexual misconduct from getting the accountability they are waiting for?

[*English*]

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the work of the committee, it makes its own decisions, but I look forward to the recommendations on which the members have been working. I know our members of the committee are absolutely committed to supporting survivors. The antics that the opposition continues to make are to prevent that work.

Our government has worked since we formed a government on providing support to survivors, with the passing of Bill C-77. We know that we have a lot more work to do and we will continue to do it.

*Oral Questions***INTERNATIONAL TRADE**

Ms. Lianne Rood (Lambton—Kent—Middlesex, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadian farmers, producers and processors are worried about market access to international markets. They are unsure whether their current market access will continue. They also want to know if they will regain access to markets that have been closed to them. I have met with many stakeholders who are very concerned that the government does not have their backs on this.

Will the government assure the House that it is actively working to guarantee and open market access for Canadian farmers, producers and processors?

Ms. Rachel Bendayan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Small Business, Export Promotion and International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me just repeat, if the member is not aware, that Canada has actually been playing a leadership role since the very beginning of this pandemic, whether at the World Trade Organization or elsewhere, to ensure that we keep our supply chains open, that no country turns inward and that we keep our rules-based international trading system intact.

We will continue to advocate for free trade right across the world and we will take every action necessary to defend our farmers and all our exports in Canada.

* * *

TOURISM INDUSTRY

Mr. Pat Kelly (Calgary Rocky Ridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, now that Canada is finally starting to catch up to the rest of the developed world on immunization, provinces, territories and municipalities are beginning to reopen. However, Canada's borders are under federal jurisdiction and there is still no clear plan for a permanent safe reopening. Thousands of small businesses are dependent on tourism and they are being left behind by the federal government.

Once again, when will the government finally table a comprehensive, detailed reopening plan?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first, over 36.3 million doses of vaccines have been shipped and 32.2 million doses administered. We are, indeed, making progress.

Today, there is good news for fully vaccinated Canadian travellers and others with right of entry to Canada: Because of their full vaccination status, they will be able to avoid some measures of quarantine, including the obligation to stay in a hotel. We will always use science and evidence to guide our next steps on the border, and we thank Canadians for stepping up and getting vaccinated in such incredible numbers.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay (South Surrey—White Rock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, more than 265,000 jobs were lost in the past two months. In April, the number of Canadians receiving regular employment insurance was up nearly 10% overall, but more than 22% for women. Women in South Surrey—White Rock who had jobs do not want EI; they want to work.

Does the Prime Minister accept any responsibility for these job losses?

• (1500)

Mr. Sean Fraser (Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and to the Minister of Middle Class Prosperity and Associate Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member refers to job losses in the past couple of months, she ignores the fact that after the previous wave, we actually saw more than 560,000 jobs created. When she is talking about the specific measures that are designed to help women take part in this economic rebound, I will acknowledge women have disproportionately been impacted.

That is specifically why we have made great game-changing investments in child care to allow more women to enter the workforce. It is why we made new investments to encourage women entrepreneurship to help kick-start economic growth. It is why we are going to continue to put supports in place that have undergone a gender-based analysis so we can understand the impact of our investments and how they impact women and men differently.

With respect to the hon. member, the best thing she can do, if she wants to support women's participation in this recovery, is to get out of the way and stop obstructing Bill C-30 so these supports can reach the people who need them.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HOUSING

Ms. Patricia Lattanzio (Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the pandemic has made the need for safe and affordable housing more obvious than ever.

My constituents have told me that affordable housing is an urgent priority. Students, young families and seniors all need affordable housing to support their well-being and to help them meet their goals.

Could the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development tell the House what has been done to make affordable housing a reality?

Hon. Ahmed Hussen (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the federal government is committed to helping Quebeckers and Canadians with their housing needs.

Since 2015, our government has invested more than \$4 billion in housing in Quebec. On June 3, we announced more than \$20 million for affordable housing for students in Montreal. We will continue to work tirelessly for Canadians and Quebeckers.

Oral Questions

[English]

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Mr. Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Pacific salmon strategy of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans is nothing but more empty promises. The Liberal government has been in power for six years and, once again, it has failed to listen to our B.C. fishers to develop and implement an effective plan to conserve and restore Pacific salmon. We do not need any more studies. We do not need any more stall tactics. We have experts on the water who know what needs to be done, and it needs to be done now.

When is the minister going to start listening to B.C. anglers and get to work on restoring our B.C. public fishery?

Hon. Bernadette Jordan (Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I actually agree with my hon. colleague. We absolutely have expertise on the west coast with regard to the wild Pacific salmon and the declines that we are seeing. That is why we are developing, in collaboration with those organizations, communities, first nations and the Province of British Columbia, the Pacific salmon strategy. This government is very proud of the fact that we are investing \$647 million in that strategy.

We know we have to do everything we possibly can to restore wild Pacific salmon.

* * *

[Translation]

INFRASTRUCTURE

Hon. Steven Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with the closing of the Pierre-Laporte bridge for repairs in a few days, construction of a third link is more important than ever to maintain the flow of traffic between Quebec City and Lévis.

What are the Liberals waiting for to follow our lead? The Conservatives are giving their support for the third link, which will help our regions and our motorists.

Will the Liberals finally make a decision and support the third link, which is essential for regional urban mobility?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as everyone knows, we are making historic investments in Quebec. I was there with the member from Quebec and the Quebec premier when a certain announcement was made last week.

With regard to the third link, we are still waiting for a proposal. We would like to see project proposals at our offices. We will continue to invest in Quebec and throughout the country.

* * *

• (1505)

[English]

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan (Calgary Forest Lawn, CPC): Mr. Speaker, for the 2020 parent and grandparent sponsorship applica-

tion term, 209,174 applications were submitted. To date, zero applications have been processed. Even worse, this current processing time is estimated to be 28 months. This Liberal-made backlog mess is hurting young families, minorities and our economy, while the Liberals pile on more platitudes and election promises.

When is the government going to fix its failed application system?

Hon. Marco Mendicino (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government has an exceptional track record in meeting our immigration goals. We welcomed tens of thousands of temporary workers to keep our economy going, adding \$100 million to protect their rights. We have reunited tens of thousands of families, showing compassion where we can. We have created new pathways for refugees, demonstrating global leadership on human rights.

Even in the face of the pandemic, we have a plan that shows how immigration creates jobs and growth, and that is in stark contrast to years of failure under the last Conservative government.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Ms. Lenore Zann (Cumberland—Colchester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Nova Scotians have been forever impacted by gun violence. Many constituents here in Cumberland—Colchester, particularly women, have told me that they support fully implementing Bill C-71, which addresses domestic violence with red flag legislation through lifetime background checks, helps law enforcement trace firearms and addresses the sale of firearms to those without a licence.

Meanwhile, worryingly, the Conservative leader is promising to weaken background checks, remove support for our police and return military firearms to the streets.

Could the Minister of Public Safety please reassure women and other concerned citizens by updating us on measures to bring Bill C-71 into force?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Hon. Bill Blair (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I most certainly share the member for Cumberland—Colchester's concern about Conservative promises to weaken gun control. I want to assure the House that our government is listening to all those who are concerned about gun violence and we are responding to the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, which has deemed Bill C-71 essential to public safety.

Earlier today, we tabled regulations that would strengthen licence verification and record-keeping in Canada. These measures would enable strong action to prevent the sale of firearms to those who are not legally authorized to possess them, and they will provide enhanced support to law enforcement to hold criminals to account.

Together, these measures will prioritize public safety and empower effective police work.

* * *

HEALTH

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the border between the United States and Canada has been closed for the past 16 months due to the COVID pandemic and following the science to protect public health. Now, with Canadians and Americans being fully vaccinated, it is time to follow the science and begin the reopening for families who have been separated for a long time and for businesses that are struggling to survive. We need no more half measures and inadequate responses. People have sacrificed and suffered enough.

When will the government follow the science and open the border to Canadians and Americans who are fully vaccinated? Canadians need a clear plan. When will the Liberals do it?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we have been doing on this side of the House. We have been following the science and the evidence. We have been working hard to make sure that the sacrifices Canadians have made over the past year and a half are not wasted.

We will continue to take prudent measures to relax measures on the border based on science and evidence. Today is a good day. Starting July 5, fully vaccinated travellers who are currently permitted to enter Canada will not be subject to the existing quarantine requirements. We can see the finish line. Let us get there together.

* * *

CANADA REVENUE AGENCY

Ms. Yasmin Ratansi (Don Valley East, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, a recent report by the International Civil Liberties Monitoring Group says that a secretive division of the CRA is unfairly targeting Muslim charities with audits amounting to discrimination. The report found that 75% of the charities audited and whose status was revoked were Muslim charities, despite them representing only 0.47% of the overall sector.

Could the minister explain what is being done to stop this harassment?

Mr. Francesco Sorbara (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government will continue to work to end discrimination on the basis of race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation and disability. The CRA monitors the operations of registered charities and ensures compliance through a balanced program of client service, education and responsible enforcement, including audits to protect the integrity of the charitable sector.

The CRA does not select registered charities for audit based on any particular faith or denomination. The Minister of National Revenue

does not instruct the CRA to begin audits, nor does the minister intervene in audits that are under way.

• (1510)

[*Translation*]

The Speaker: The time for question period has expired.

The hon. member for Beloeil—Chambly on a point of order.

* * *

RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am at the Maison amérindienne in Mont-Saint-Hilaire. There have been discussions among the parties and if you seek it, I think you will find unanimous consent for the following motion:

That the House, recognizing the importance of historical truth in the process of healing grieving families and nations, insist that the government deploy, for the benefit—

The Speaker: I apologize to the hon. member for interrupting, but there is a problem with the interpretation.

While we wait for the problem to be resolved, I give the floor to the hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent, who also wishes to rise on a point of order.

Mr. Gérard Deltell: Mr. Speaker, as everyone knows, when a member rises to move a motion in the House, they must always have the proper equipment. We saw that the leader of the Bloc Québécois did not have the necessary equipment. That being said, I think that all parties know what the leader of the Bloc Québécois wants to talk about, and I seek the consent of the House to let him continue.

The Speaker: All those opposed to the hon. member moving the motion will please say nay.

[*English*]

I am asking for consent for the motion that the hon. member for Louis-Saint Laurent just put forward.

Mr. Gérard Deltell: Mr. Speaker, I think we all recognize that the member for Beloeil—Chambly is not set up correctly to address the House of Commons. We also know what he wants to talk about today.

What I would suggest to my colleague for Beloeil—Chambly is that he first make his presentation in French and then after that, if he can, translate it to be sure that every member will have access, in both official languages, to his proposition of the day.

[*Translation*]

The Speaker: The problem with the interpretation is due to the fact that the member does not have the proper equipment. Does the hon. member for Beloeil—Chambly agree to proceed as the member for Louis-Saint-Laurent suggested?

Oral Questions

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure about the nature of the request because I cannot simultaneously interpret—

The Speaker: The problem is that we cannot hear the member for Beloeil-Chambly properly because he is not using the official equipment provided by the House.

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet: Mr. Speaker, please give me 30 seconds to change headsets.

The Speaker: Order. I would ask for the attention of the House.

Even if we could understand—barely—what the hon. member for Beloeil-Chambly was saying, it was not clear enough for the interpreters. It was therefore suggested that the member start in one official language and then repeat the same thing in the other official language so that everyone could understand. Is that agreeable to everyone?

Hon. members: Agreed.

The Speaker: That is how we will proceed. The hon. member for Beloeil-Chambly will start in the official language of his choice and then repeat the same thing in the other official language. The hon. member for Beloeil-Chambly.

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet: Mr. Speaker, I am at the Maison amérindienne de Mont-Saint-Hilaire. There have been discussions among the parties and if you seek it I believe you will find unanimous consent for the following motion:

That the House, recognizing the importance of historical truth in the process of healing grieving families and nations, insist that the government deploy, for the benefit of indigenous communities, the financial resources necessary to carry out every call to action in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in order for indigenous communities to have the technical and scientific means and the project management necessary for the identification of sites and the establishment of registers, as well as for historical research and the commemoration of the victims;

That the House ask the government, in consultation with affected indigenous communities, to place the new information that would be collected for the purpose of finding all the missing children under the aegis of the National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation, all under the authority of the indigenous people;

That the House recognize that Ottawa is located on the traditional territory of the Algonquin people and, acting accordingly, affirm that it is urgent that call to action number 82 of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, providing for the construction of a national monument to residential schools, be erected in Ottawa and reiterate that it is essential that all recognized national indigenous organizations be involved in the process, as they should; and finally,

That the House ask the federal government to push all religious communities that participated in the residential school system to give access to the relevant archives to researchers, to indigenous communities, and to survivors and their families.

• (1515)

The Speaker: Can the hon. member repeat the text of the motion in English? The House made that decision because the interpretation was not available.

I want to ensure that everyone understands exactly what is being moved.

[*English*]

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet: Mr. Speaker, there has been consultation between the parties, and I think you will find unanimous consent for the following motion.

I move:

That the House, recognizing the importance of historical truth in the process of healing grieving families and nations, insist that the government deploy, for the benefit of indigenous communities, the financial resources necessary to carry out every call to action in the truth and reconciliation Commission in order for indigenous communities to have the technical and scientific means and the project management necessary for the identification of sites and the establishment of registers, as well as for historical research and the commemoration of the victims;

That the House ask the government, in consultation with affected indigenous communities, to place the new information that would be collected for the purpose of finding all the missing children under the aegis of the National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation, all under the authority of the indigenous people;

That the House recognize that Ottawa is located on the traditional territory of the Algonquin people and, acting accordingly, affirm that it is urgent that call to action number 82 of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, providing for the construction of a national monument to residential schools, be erected in Ottawa and reiterate that it is essential that all recognized national indigenous organizations be involved in the process, as they should; and finally,

That the House ask the federal government to push all religious communities that participated in the residential school system to give access to the relevant archives to researchers, to indigenous communities, and to survivors and their families.

[*Translation*]

The Speaker: All those opposed to the hon. member moving the motion will please say nay.

[*English*]

The House has heard the terms of the motion. All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

(Motion agreed to)

The Speaker: I would like to take this opportunity to remind everyone that, if they are going to do something in a different location than they are used to, they should please make sure the equipment is at hand and tested previously. It will just make things work so much more smoothly, and it will make things a lot easier.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent on a point of order.

Mr. Gérard Deltell: Mr. Speaker, I will make myself clear so everyone understands what I am saying.

We have to follow certain rules. Yes, there are technical considerations, but location matters too. I completely understand what motivated the member for Beloeil—Chambly, the leader of the Bloc Québécois, to do this on National Indigenous Peoples Day and to do it in an indigenous centre. That puts us all in a positive frame of mind. Plus, his proposal, which he read in both official languages, was unanimously adopted.

I invite the Speaker to issue a recommendation about whether we are supposed to be in the House, in our parliamentary office or in our riding office. If it should so happen that we are not in one of those three places, I believe, although we would have to reread what has been said about this, that we are expected to inform the House in advance so officials can make sure everything is working properly.

For today, it is understandable. I would be the first to agree, because Wendake is in my riding. We can move symbolic motions like the one moved today. However, I think we need a rule, should a member choose to speak from somewhere other than the House of Commons.

● (1520)

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent, who raised a very good point.

I would like to remind all members that the House is a neutral place, as free of symbols as possible. Sometimes, we do not notice it at all, but it is very important to make sure that the House is as neutral as possible.

It being 3:22 p.m., pursuant to order made on Thursday, June 17, it is my duty to ask the Sergeant-at-Arms to admit Mr. Iain Stewart.

* * *

[English]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESIDENT OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH AGENCY OF CANADA

The Speaker: Mr. Stewart, you are attending at the bar of the House on behalf of the Public Health Agency of Canada for failure to comply with the orders of the Special Committee on Canada–China Relations of March 31 and May 10, 2021, and the order of the House of June 2, 2021.

The orders in question called for unredacted versions of all the documents produced by the Public Health Agency of Canada about the transfer of the Ebola and Henipah viruses to the Wuhan Institute of Virology in March 2019 and the subsequent revocation of the security clearances of Dr. Xiangguo Qiu and Keding Cheng.

[Translation]

The privileges held by the House of Commons are an integral part of the Constitution Act, 1867, and the Parliament of Canada Act. These rights include the right to require the production of documents. Under the Standing Orders of the House of Commons, committees of the House exercise these same rights when carrying out their respective mandates.

[English]

The privileges in question, like all those enjoyed by the House collectively and by members individually, are essential to the performance of their duties. The House has the power, and indeed the duty, to reaffirm them when obstruction or interference impedes its deliberations. As guardian of these rights and privileges, that is precisely what the House has asked me to do today by ordering the Speaker to reprimand you for the Public Health Agency of Canada's contempt in refusing to submit the required documents.

The House further ordered you to immediately submit unredacted versions of the documents to it. However, through your counsel, the Speaker was informed that you are unable to deliver the documents referenced in the order.

In this regard, I have received a communication earlier today from counsel representing the president of the Public Health Agency of Canada in relation to the order of the House adopted on Thursday, June 17, 2021.

Points of Order

● (1525)

[Translation]

As the letter is in only one language, it would require unanimous consent for me to table the letter.

[English]

All those opposed to the tabling of the letter in one language, please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: I understand there is a point of order being raised by the government House leader.

The hon. government House leader.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

DOCUMENTS RELATED TO THE TRANSFER OF EBOLA AND HENIPAH VIRUSES TO THE WUHAN INSTITUTE OF VIROLOGY

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House how the government believes we can move forward on the issue of the document order from June 2. Today, I wrote a letter to you in which I went into some detail on this issue, and I would like to explain to the House what I proposed in this letter, if I may.

The House of Commons adopted a motion on June 17, 2021, “That the House find the Public Health Agency of Canada to be in—”

The Speaker: I will interrupt the hon. government House leader.

The opposition House leader has a point of order.

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we shall follow the rules step by step. You were talking about the June 17 decision. There is someone here, and we are asking this person to table documents. Do what you have to do, and after that we will see if there are any documents. If there are none, we will address it.

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

The Speaker: I want to interrupt the hon. government House leader. Mr. Stewart is still with us, and I want to consult with the table. This is a very touchy situation. I want to make sure that we take the proper steps so that there will not be any questions afterward.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, could you at least consider hearing the rest of the point of order by the government House leader?

The Speaker: I have made my statement. I ask all members to sit and wait while we consult. It is a matter that we must go over. As I said, this is a unique situation. I want to make sure that we get it right on all sides. This is not to show any favouritism to one side or the other; I just want to go over it.

The Chair is in the hands of the House. Nothing in the order of June 17 provided for the possibility of taking measures, nor does the order give the Chair the authority to respond to the situation the House is currently facing. It is up to the House to decide.

Points of Order

I will go back to the hon. government House leader and ask if the point of order he is raising is directly related to what we are discussing now. If it is not, I would ask him to please inform the House and we shall continue.

The hon. government House leader.

• (1530)

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, the point of order is totally related.

Mr. Blake Richards (Banff—Airdrie, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Correct me if I am mistaken, but I believe you were interrupted while trying to finish the statement you were making. You were admonishing the Public Health Agency of Canada, and I think you should be able to finish your statement before there is a point of order responding to that statement. I think you should have the right to—

The Speaker: To correct the hon. member for Banff—Airdrie, I was done and about to dismiss Mr. Stewart when the hon. government House leader rose on a point of order to bring information forward. It was brought after. Right now we are dealing with that to see if it is directly related.

This is what I am going to do. I will listen to what the government House leader has to say and then determine relevance afterward. If it is way out of whack, I will stop him, but I believe what he has to say is related.

I stopped the hon. member because what he brought up was not exactly correct.

Mr. Blake Richards: I have a point of order.

The Speaker: I think we will listen to what has to be said and then we will deal with that after.

The hon. government House leader.

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, it is totally related.

The president of the Public Health Agency of Canada has worked diligently to try to comply with the order of June 2, 2021. He has done so in a manner that balances the rights of parliamentarians to have access to information with the duty of the government to protect information related to national security and privacy.

[*Translation*]

The Parliament of Canada Act states in section 4 that the privileges, immunities and powers of the two Houses are to be those that were held in 1867 by the House of Commons of the United Kingdom, and such privileges, immunities and powers as are defined by an act of the Parliament of Canada.

The Parliament of Canada, in exercising its legislative authority to define the privileges of the Houses, may circumscribe those privileges and has done so. A statute may be made expressly applicable to the Senate and the House of Commons or may apply implicitly, by necessary intentment.

As well, statutes of Parliament may impose duties of non-disclosure on government officials. As the Supreme Court observed in *Canada (House of Commons) v. Vaid* in 2005, “Legislative bodies

created by the Constitution Act, 1867 do not constitute enclaves shielded from the ordinary law of the land.”

Furthermore, in *Chagnon v. Syndicat de la fonction publique et parapublique du Québec*, Justice Rowe, in concurring with the majority of the court, added, “...expecting a legislature to comply with its own legislation cannot be regarded as an intrusion on the legislature's privilege. It is not an impediment to the functioning of a legislature for it to comply with its own enactments. Accordingly, when a legislature has set out in legislation how something previously governed pursuant to privilege is to operate, the legislature no longer can rely on inherent privilege so as to bypass the statute.”

Parliamentary privilege has been circumscribed by valid statutes, and the House of Commons cannot now choose to relieve itself from their application.

As we know, the Minister of Health referred the matter and provided unredacted documents to the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians, given the expertise of the members of the committee in matters of national security. The committee has a broad mandate to review Canada's legislative, regulatory, policy, administrative and financial framework for national security and intelligence. It may also—

The Speaker: I would ask the hon. Leader of the Government in the House of Commons to be very specific in his point of order. He is giving many details, but I do not believe that this is necessary.

I will let him continue for a few minutes and I hope that he will have time to finish his comments. I want to ensure that we hear from everyone to the greatest extent possible before giving my ruling.

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, the connection to the matter before us will soon be clear.

Of course the government wants to collaborate. That is what it has been trying to do from the start, in a way that respects parliamentary privilege and extremely important national security issues.

I am going to skip a whole section of my presentation and jump right to my proposal.

We are putting various options before you, all of them valid, in my opinion. I think it would be worth your while to read them so that we can find a solution that works for all parliamentarians and all parties.

• (1535)

[*English*]

I will not be very long.

The first option relates to what I call a memorandum of understanding regarding Afghan detainee documents. In response to the ruling by Speaker Milliken in 2010, the government and the opposition agreed to a memorandum of understanding that created an ad hoc committee of parliamentarians to review national security documents. It included safeguards and a panel of arbiters to determine how the relevant and necessary information could be made available to MPs and the public without compromising national security. A similar memorandum of understanding could be used for the review of the documents that the House has ordered.

As a second option, the Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel could be assisted by national security specialists.

The motion adopted by the House on June 2, 2021, states, in part:

(d) the Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel shall confidentially review the documents with a view to redacting information which, in his opinion, could reasonably be expected to compromise national security or reveal details of an ongoing criminal investigation, other than the existence of an investigation;

(e) the Speaker shall cause the documents, as redacted pursuant to paragraph (d), to be laid upon the table at the next earliest opportunity and, after being tabled, they shall stand referred to the special committee;

While the government accepts that the Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel has the appropriate security clearance to review the information, we do not believe he has the necessary training or expertise in national security-related information to make the necessary assessment. Disclosing sensitive information could have a number of negative side effects for our intelligence agencies. These include, *inter alia*, revealing covert methods of operation and tradecraft and investigative techniques; putting at risk human sources and their families; and identifying or helping to identify employees, internal procedures and administrative practices. Finally, it could have a severe impact on Canada's reputation as a responsible security partner.

[*Translation*]

Assessing the damage caused by disclosure of information cannot be done in the abstract or in isolation. Seemingly unrelated information can be used to develop a more comprehensive picture or “mosaic effect” when added to information already known, thereby revealing further tradecraft. Declassification of documents needs to undergo a review which takes into account the potential impact on covert methodologies, sources and relationships.

The government is open to providing the unredacted documents to the Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel if the House of Commons agrees that national security specialists can assist him in this process and that other appropriate safeguards be put in place.

It is our hope that the government and the opposition can come to a reasonable solution that ensures that the government can continue to respect its obligations to protect national security, and the House of Commons can effectively do its work.

The Speaker: The hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent on a point of order. Other hon. members can then rise on a point of order.

The hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent.

Privilege

PRIVILEGE

ALLEGED NON-COMPLIANCE WITH AN ORDER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what my friend, the government House leader, just did is completely unacceptable. He disregarded the ruling you made on June 17.

If the member had something to say about this matter, he could have done it at the appropriate time, 10 days ago, when the member for Kingston and the Islands responded to my well-researched speech. That was when the government leader should have made the argument he made just a couple of minutes ago, instead of having the member for Kingston and the Islands give a speech, although I must say it was an interesting one. However, you considered the strength of the arguments and made a decision. You acknowledged that our proposal was a fair one.

We proposed that the president of the Public Health Agency of Canada attend at the bar of the House to receive an admonishment and to deliver the documents. When this matter was duly put to a vote on June 17, it then became an order.

That order contained two elements. The first was that the president, Mr. Stewart, attend at the bar of the House. I see that he is still there, which is good. The second is that he be admonished by the House, and that is what you did.

However, the story does not end there. The June 17 motion was very clear. The majority of the House of Commons, all of the opposition parties, voted in favour of it. He was supposed to deliver up the documents related to the Winnipeg lab without redaction. That demand has not been met.

That is why I am informing you that I am raising a question of privilege related to the fact that this order of the House was not followed, given the refusal of Iain Stewart, president of the Public Health Agency of Canada, to produce certain documents when he attended at the bar, contrary to the order adopted by the House on Thursday, June 17.

Standing Order 48(2) normally requires that I give one hour's notice if my question of privilege is not one “arising out of proceedings in the chamber during the course of a sitting”.

Mr. Stewart received the order to attend at the bar of the House this day for the purposes of “delivering up the documents ordered by the House, on June 2, 2021, to be produced, so that they may be deposited with the Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel under the terms of that order”.

● (1540)

[*English*]

Mr. Stewart was here but he did not deliver what we were asking for. This is why we are talking about a question of privilege here today.

Privilege

[Translation]

I want to stress that that is the real issue. The order of the House required two things: that Mr. Stewart attend the House to receive the admonishment, which he has done, and that he produce the documents, which he has not done.

That is why the House is once again debating this issue. This is an important question of privilege related to what happened here a few minutes ago.

House of Commons Procedure and Practice, third edition, at page 82, lays out the well-established list of types of contempt of Parliament.

[English]

I will refer members to the ninth and 10th items.

[Translation]

It includes:

- ...without reasonable excuse, refusing to answer a question or provide information or produce papers formally required by the House or a committee;
- without reasonable excuse, disobeying a lawful order of the House or a committee;

[English]

Both of those have happened before our eyes today.

[Translation]

There is no question that Mr. Stewart was aware of the order made Thursday. He testified before the Standing Committee on Health on Friday, and said he was aware of the motion adopted in the House of Commons. That is a good thing.

Parliamentary Privilege in Canada, second edition, states, at page 240, “Disobedience of rules or orders is an obvious contempt and would include refusing to attend at the Bar of the House after the House had so ordered, refusing to personally attend and to produce the documents requested by a committee...”.

The documents Mr. Stewart was to produce were requested on four distinct occasions, last spring.

The Speaker: The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands on a point of order.

[English]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We have now had Mr. Stewart here for about half an hour. He has been standing diligently at the bar. I think it would be appropriate for the Speaker to allow him to leave now, so he can get back to the important work he has been doing over the last 15 months looking to protect this country.

I would ask that the Speaker allow Mr. Stewart to leave at this time. I think the Conservatives, the NDP and the Bloc have proven their point, and now it is time for him to be able to depart.

The Speaker: I do not believe that is a point of order.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Order, please.

I would like to point out that I had discussions with the Sergeant-at-Arms prior to Mr. Stewart's coming here to ensure that, should Mr. Stewart want to sit, there would be a chair for him there. There is one there, so he can be comfortable, if he prefers to sit.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order.

The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands was going to ask for unanimous consent. I will let him proceed with that, and then we will continue with the hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I would ask for unanimous consent to let the president of the Public Health Agency depart at this time.

The Speaker: All those opposed to the request of the hon. member will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: There is no unanimous consent.

I would like to remind the hon. member for Cambridge that his face does show up when he speaks online. I do not want to embarrass him, but there is enough tension in this room. We do not need it coming in.

Mr. Brian May: I am not embarrassed, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Mr. May, please stand down.

The hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent.

• (1545)

[Translation]

Mr. Gérard Deltell: Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, you ruled that the House had every right to compel the production of documents. You also ruled that, contrary to a reckless Liberal opposition motion from 2009 and 2010, the House had taken the necessary steps to balance parliamentary responsibility with protecting national security, and to promote dialogue with the government on the issue.

[English]

The only way was to put forward a motion to order Mr. Stewart to appear in this House today, at the bar, with those documents.

[Translation]

It is also within the authority of the House, as indicated in *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, 2017, at page 130.

It is incumbent on us to do something. The House must defend itself and assert its rights.

Citation 120 of *Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, sixth edition, states that with respect to questions of privilege, at first glance, and I quote: “Should the House wish to proceed without reference to the committee it may do so.”

Maingot adds at page 263, and I quote: “It is nevertheless open in flagrant cases of contemptuous conduct to move that the facts in question constitute a breach of privilege”.

In the First Report from the Select Committee on Procedure, session 1977-78 of the United Kingdom House of Commons, at paragraph 57, appendix C, a former clerk of that House, Sir Richard Barlas, wrote, and I quote: "Failure to comply with a formal order to attend or to produce papers may be dealt with by the House as a contempt; so may the failure to answer questions when giving evidence." Such a failure should in fact be investigated by the Committee of Privileges. "[T]he House itself could and has dealt with the matter as one of privilege on a report being made by the committee concerned, and exercised its penal jurisdiction accordingly."

Last week, we proceeded without reference to the committee to call Mr. Stewart to the bar to produce the requested documents. I would remind the House that it was the majority of elected members here in the House who voted for that action. It was not a wish or a request, it was an order. These documents still have not been produced. The urgency of the matter has not changed.

Paragraph 302 of the 1999 report of the Joint Committee on Parliamentary Privilege in the United Kingdom clearly states, and I quote, "If the work of Parliament is to proceed without improper interference, there must ultimately be some sanction available against those who offend: those who interrupt the proceedings or destroy evidence, or seek to intimidate members or witnesses; those who disobey orders of the House or a committee to attend and answer questions or produce documents....But unless a residual power to punish exists, the obligation not to obstruct will be little more than a pious aspiration. The absence of a sanction will be cynically exploited by some persons from time to time."

That is exactly where we are right now.

[English]

That said, what would be more important than imposing a sanction would be for the—

The Speaker: I am going to interrupt the hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent.

[Translation]

The hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier is rising on a point of order.

Hon. Mona Fortier: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table, in both official languages, the letter sent by the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons on this subject.

[English]

Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it, you will find unanimous consent for the following motion. I move:

That Mr. Iain Stewart be dismissed from the bar of the House.

The Speaker: All those opposed to the hon. member moving the motion will please say nay.

The House has heard the terms of the motion. All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

I declare the motion carried. Mr. Stewart, you may leave.

(Motion agreed to)

Privilege

• (1550)

[Translation]

The Speaker: The hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent.

I see he has a lot to say. I hope he will be as concise as possible.

Mr. Gérard Deltell: Mr. Speaker, we have seen worse.

[English]

That said, what would be more important than imposing a sanction would be for the powers of this House to be vindicated by obtaining the documents. Allowing the Special Committee on Canada-China Relations to do its work would be, in my opinion, more valuable than deliberating on how to scold the Public Health Agency a second time.

If the House were so inclined, it can arrest someone or even commit him or her to jail. For example, had Mr. Stewart not even showed up today, the authorities are clear that we could send Sergeant-at-Arms to bring him here.

[Translation]

Paragraph 121 in Beauchesne, in reference to persons summoned to attend at the bar, indicates that if the person is not present, "the absence is noted and the House orders the Speaker to issue a warrant for him to be taken into custody."

That did not happen, however. Mr. Stewart did what he had to do, that is present himself to the House, but he did not do what the order asked him to do, and that is submit the documents.

Sir Bourinot's *Parliamentary Procedure and Practice in the Dominion of Canada*, fourth edition, states on page 62, and I quote, "If, when the order of the day has been read at the appointed time, the sergeant-at-arms informs the house that the person summoned is not in attendance, or cannot be found, the house will instruct the speaker to issue a warrant for his arrest."

That did not take place, and that is all the better.

I will also quote from *Parliamentary Practice in New-Zealand*, which states, at page 794, "the House may also use its...powers to enforce and uphold its privileges. It may...coerce someone to do something it wishes to be done, for example committing a person to the custody of the Serjeant-at-Arms so that he or she may be brought to give evidence before a committee. When using its powers in this way, the House is not 'punishing' anyone for past transgressions, but rather ensuring that no transgressions occur."

It goes on to say, "The House uses its powers to secure compliance with its orders before there has been any disobedience of them. If a person committed into the Serjeant's custody escaped, then a contempt would be committed and the person would be liable to be punished. The distinction between punishing for disobedience and taking action to secure compliance can be a fine one where there is disobedience to the House's order."

Privilege

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote the most recent example, a ruling by your predecessor, the hon. member for Halifax West, on May 18, 2016, which can be found at page 3547 of the Debates of the House of Commons. Members will recall this sad day. The ruling had to do with the incident in which the Prime Minister crossed the floor and forcibly grabbed the official opposition whip by the arm like a common thug and dragged him back to his seat. It was one of the most disgraceful incidents in the history of our Parliament. The supreme political authority of this country behaved with the dignity of a thug. A few hours later, he admitted his mistake and formally apologized in the House of Commons. The member for Papineau did the right thing. Let us remember the parliamentary consequences of that incident.

In this case, after some brief comments, the Speaker simply said:

I appreciate the comments of all the members who have spoken, and I appreciate the Prime Minister's apology.

Having said that, I cannot help but find a prima facie case of question of privilege and I call upon the hon. member for York—Simcoe to move the appropriate motion.

Mr. Speaker, since you do not have any written notice in this case, I would like to read the motion that I intend to move.

[*English*]

The motion states: That the House find that the Public Health Agency of Canada continues to be in contempt for its failure to obey the orders of the House, adopted on June 2 and June 17, 2021, as well as the orders of the Special Committee on Canada-China Relations, adopted on March 21 and May 10, 2021, and, accordingly, directs the Sergeant-at-Arms attending this House to enter into the premises of the Public Health Agency of Canada to search for and seize the documents which were ordered to be produced by the House on June 2 and June 17, 2021, and by the Special Committee on Canada-China Relations on March 21 and May 10, 2021, and to deposit the documents with the Law Clerk and Parliamentary Council under the terms of the order of the House adopted on June 2, 2021 and that the Speaker do issue this warrant accordingly.

[*Translation*]

We had previously worked on a motion that was reviewed by the Chair and staff, who concluded that the proposal was not acceptable, so we immediately came up with a new one, which was adopted.

That is why we came prepared for every contingency this time around. If, by chance, the Chair decides that this first motion does not meet the requirements of the House, here is a second one that can be used moving forward.

• (1555)

[*English*]

The motion states: That the House find the Public Health Agency of Canada continues to be in contempt for its failure to obey the orders of the House, adopted on June 2 and 17, 2021, as well as the orders of the Special Committee on Canada-China Relations, adopted on March 31 and May 10, 2021, and, accordingly, refers the matter to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs for its consideration of an enforcement mechanism available for this House to obtain the documents previously ordered by the

House and the special committee to be produced to provide that: (a) the committee to be instructed to report back within four weeks of the adoption of this order to provide that in the event it does not do so, it shall be deemed to have presented a report making the following recommendations: “That the Sergeant attending this House be directed to enter the premises of the Public Health Agency of Canada to search inside for the documents which were ordered to be produced by the House on June 2 and 17, 2021, and by the Special Committee on Canada-China Relations on March 31 and May 10, 2021, and to table these documents with the Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel, under the terms of the order of the House adopted on June 2, 2021, and that the Speaker do issue a warrant accordingly; (b) any report which is ready to be presented when the House stands adjourned may be submitted electronically to the Clerk of the House and shall be deemed to have been duly presented to the House on that date, and (c) the provisions in paragraph (q) of the order adopted on Monday, January 25, 2021, concerning committee proceedings shall apply to maintain the committee held in relation to this order of reference until Sunday, September 19, 2021.

Let me be clear: This House has a job to do and this House shall be respected and especially shall be respected by all members, because we are 338 Canadians here in the House of Commons but we are more than citizens.

We are representatives of our constituents. When we do not pay respect to the House, we do not pay respect to the Canadian citizens. This is why, Mr. Speaker, I think that you will realize and recognize that if we let it pass, no one can address anything further.

[*Translation*]

This is all about respect for the House, which is made up of 338 Canadians who were duly elected by the public. If the House does not respect its orders, who will respect the laws adopted by the House? Who will respect the regulations adopted by the House? Who will respect the political decisions made after debates, albeit spirited ones, but decisions that were voted on by the individuals who were duly elected by the public?

The June 17 order was very clear, and two things were supposed to happen. The president of the Public Health Agency of Canada was to appear here and receive an admonishment. He was also meant to deliver the documents, but he did not.

It is like someone saying that they do not believe in a law, that it does not apply to them and that they do not care about the consequences because they do not believe in it. It is one thing if we are talking about a citizen who believes their rights have been violated. However, that is not how it works, and even less so when that someone is an elected official.

The House must respect the House. That is why I urge the Chair to take my question of privilege into consideration.

[*English*]

The Speaker: I have a long list of people who are rising on a point of order. I will get to them in the order in which I have noticed them.

The hon. member for St. John's East.

Mr. Jack Harris (St. John's East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I wish to intervene, first, on the point of order raised by the government House leader, but also to speak to the question of privilege raised by the opposition House leader.

The government House leader, allegedly having a point of order, made an argument against the order that was made. He did say in his opening remarks that the president of the Public Health Agency of Canada had to balance his obligations under legislation and the order of the House. That is absolutely wrong and totally contrary to the decision made by you, Mr. Speaker, and by the decision on which is based, that of Speaker of Milliken in April 2010.

It is not up to Mr. Stewart to decide what the balance is. Nor is it up to the government House leader. In fact, it is up to the House of Commons to achieve the balance and determine how to balance the national interest, whether it be with respect to security, privacy or anything else, with the privileges of members of the House with respect to access to documents.

The House has already determined that matter. The points made by the government House leader seem to be offering some sort of alternative to the method adopted by the House. Clearly, there were plenty of opportunities for him to do that during the debate in the House on the motion that was moved. It could have been done at committee. It could have been done during debate on the opposition motion or on the debate on the matter of privilege. On all those occasions, he could have come forward and offered another method of doing the same thing that would give access to the documents to the committee, which has passed a motion for their acceptance and the House has determined such.

It certainly did not come before the House as a proper point of order. It was really a matter of debate, a debate that should have taken place on one of the other occasions, before the decision was made by the House. That is what I have to say about the point of order. The point of order should be dismissed.

The question of privilege that was raised by the opposition House leader is quite appropriate. We have a situation where the president of the Public Health Agency of Canada has complied with part of the order, but not the full order. Therefore, he is in breach of the order of the House, and a proper remedy has been suggested.

I am assuming there was two suggestions, actually one that the Sergeant-at-Arms be ordered, immediately, to undertake a search of the premises of the Public Health Agency of Canada with appropriate support, which has been done in the past, to obtain the papers that have been ordered by the House, or, alternatively, to present to the committee on procedure and House affairs to follow through. I think this was the committee that was recommended.

Either of those alternatives would be a way to proceed. I would leave that to you, Mr. Speaker, to decide what is the appropriate method in keeping with the precedents. I am speaking virtually, and I do not have access many of the authorities to respond specifically to the various sections of our procedures and rules. I would leave that to you and your assistants to determine the exact and appropriate method.

I would reiterate his assertion that the House is the master of the situation, not the government, not the government House leader,

Privilege

and that you as Speaker are entrusted with enforcing the privileges of all members of the House, including the government members and the cabinet ministers who also sit as members of the House. It is their privileges, it is our privileges, it is the people's privileges that we have the obligation to uphold. I commend you, Sir, to your deliberations.

I hope we could resolve this impasse by a proper order from you, Mr. Speaker, to comply with the order of the House.

• (1600)

The Speaker: We will go to the government House leader.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, to begin with, I would ask that you take the statements I made during my point of order on the question of privilege and include them all in the debate.

I would add the following comments to the debate on the question of privilege.

[*English*]

The government respects the right of the House of Commons to order documents, but we also believe firmly in what the former House of Commons Speaker, Speaker Milliken, articulated in his ruling on April 27, 2010, where in the context of an order for national security-related documents he stated:

But what of the House's responsibility regarding the manner in which this right can or ought to be exercised? The authorities cited earlier all make reference to the long-standing practice whereby the House has accepted that not all documents demanded ought to be made available in cases where the Government asserts that this is impossible or inappropriate for reasons of national security, national defence or international relations.

O'Brien and Bosc, at page 979, states: "—it may not be appropriate to insist on the production of papers and records in all cases."

The basis for this statement is a 1991 report by the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, which, as recorded on page 95 of the Journals of May 29, 1991, pointed out:

The House of Commons recognizes that it should not require the production of documents in all cases; considerations of public policy, including national security, foreign relations, and so forth, enter into the decision as to when it is appropriate to order the production of such documents.

He further stated:

Now it seems to me that the issue before us is this: Is it possible to put in place a mechanism by which these documents could be made available to the House without compromising the security and confidentiality of the information they contain? In other words, is it possible for the two sides, working together in the best interests of the Canadians they serve, to devise a means where both their concerns are met? Surely that is not too much to hope for.

Speaker Milliken's ruling is an important precedent to guide how both the government and the House can come to a resolution on this important issue. The government wishes to work constructively with all members of Parliament to find a solution that respects the balance of interest between the rights of parliamentarians to have access to information and the obligations of the government to protect information related to national security and privacy.

Privilege

• (1605)

[*Translation*]

As we all know, given the sensitivity of the information in question, the president of the Public Health Agency of Canada gave notice to the Attorney General of Canada pursuant to subsection 38.01(1) of the Canada Evidence Act on June 20, 2021, advising that “sensitive or potentially injurious information” was at risk of being disclosed as a result of the June 17 House of Commons order.

Under section 38.02 of the Canada Evidence Act, “no person shall disclose in connection with a proceeding (a) information about which notice is given...”. This means that information subject to the notice cannot be disclosed until the Attorney General assesses whether its disclosure would be injurious to national security or after the Federal Court has ordered its disclosure.

That being said, the Attorney General can, at any time under the Canada Evidence Act, authorize disclosure of the sensitive information if he is satisfied that measures are put in place to safeguard it. Given this, the government wishes to work constructively with the members of Parliament to find a solution that reflects the balance noted above and is willing to continue to seek a path forward that does not require the court's involvement. This would require the agreement of the Attorney General of Canada.

I have offered concrete solutions. I spoke of two very real options that would allow us to resolve this.

[*English*]

I made reference to the memorandum of understanding. I gave the example of the documents relating to the Afghan detainees. That is one option that can be used by the House.

The second option is related to the law clerk and parliamentary counsel, assisted by national security specialists.

[*Translation*]

These two options are concrete and real, and they respect both the will of the House and all of the government's obligations with regard to privacy and the protection of potentially sensitive information, the disclosure of which could be injurious to the country, individuals and institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to take the time to analyze these two very concrete options and solutions so that we can work together with the opposition parties to the benefit of all parliamentarians, but also for the benefit of all Canadians, which is much more important.

• (1610)

[*English*]

Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we once lived in a country where the Governor in Council ignored the will of the elected legislature. We once lived in a country where the executive council ignored the will of the legislative assembly. We once lived in a country where the chief minister and the cabinet ignored Parliament. That was a country long ago. That was a country some 18 decades ago and it was that ignorance of the elected legislature that led to the people rising up. It led to insurrection, it led to the rebellions of 1837 and it led ultimately to reforms. It led to the introduction of responsible government, first in the leg-

islature in Halifax, Nova Scotia, which was established in 1758, and subsequently, several years later, in the predecessor Parliament to this one: the Parliament of the United Province of Canada in the 1840s.

It led to Louis-Hippolyte LaFontaine and Robert Baldwin establishing the first responsible government, the first great ministry of Canada, on February 25, 1848. It was an important milestone that established the fundamental concept that the executive branch of government is accountable to the elected legislature, that the executive branch of government cannot ignore the orders of this place, cannot ignore the bills that are passed and adopted in this place and the other place, and cannot ignore the will of the elected House of Commons. Until that point, the Governor in Council regularly ignored Parliament and the elected legislature. Bills were often vetoed by the governor. Orders of the House were ignored. The Governor in Council hired and fired advisers at will and made his own decisions, the legislature be damned.

The introduction of responsible government was an event so important that on Parliament Hill we have a statue to Louis-Hippolyte LaFontaine and Robert Baldwin that overlooks the Ottawa River and is labelled at the bottom, chiselled in stone, “Responsible government”. Since the introduction of that responsible government, Canada's democracy has evolved to the point that we now accept that the government is accountable to the House, but the Liberal government is rolling back 18 decades of parliamentary evolution with its defiance now of four orders of the House and its committee.

The situation in front of us is rapidly evolving from a situation in which the government is simply refusing to provide documents related to the termination of Dr. Qiu and Dr. Cheng, and the transfer of materials from the Winnipeg National Microbiology Laboratory to the Wuhan Institute of Virology, to a situation that is much more serious and that involves the rule of law. The rule of law is such a sacrosanct part of the trinity of our principles of a belief in democratic institutions, human rights and liberty and the rule of law, that the 1982 Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms put in its preamble that this country recognizes the supremacy of the rule of law, and the Liberal government is seriously undermining that rule of law with its flagrant disobedience of the four orders of this elected chamber.

There have been two strong precedents in recent years to support the orders of the House and its call for documents. One is the case that has been referred to many times, in which Speaker Milliken's ruling of 2010 made clear that it is the grand inquest of the nation that this chamber has an unfettered, absolute right to call for the production of papers, full stop. There was a more recent example two and a half years ago in the mother Parliament of the United Kingdom, when the Conservative British Prime Minister of the day defied Parliament and said she would not release the Attorney General's solicitor client-protected opinion on the Irish backstop in relation to the Brexit deal.

• (1615)

She refused to hand over those documents, and the House found her in contempt and ordered that her Attorney General come to the House with the documents, which Attorney General Geoffrey Cox did because the British government understood the importance of the rule of law, the importance of Parliament and the importance of democracy. That is why the current Canadian government cannot be allowed to get away with this flagrant defiance of four orders of the House.

I will finish by saying this. Why do Canadians send 338 of their fellow citizens to this chamber if their decisions are going to be ignored? Why do we spend \$400 million a year on this chamber and the other one if our votes do not mean anything? Why do we vote to adopt orders if they do not have effect? Why are we spending billions of dollars on these buildings, some \$5 billion on Centre Block alone at last count, if the processes and procedures in this place do not mean anything?

We cannot allow this open defiance of the House to go unchallenged. We must uphold parliamentary democracy, and we must ensure the government fulfills the order of the House.

Mr. Blake Richards (Banff—Airdrie, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

That is a very tough act to follow. Very powerful and passionate arguments were just made by the member for Wellington—Halton Hills defending the importance of the decisions made in this place and the democracy that we have. I probably will be far less interesting, powerful and passionate, but I have a couple of citations to make that I think the Speaker will find helpful in making his decision, and I would like to share those with him.

Central to the very key elements of the intervention from our opposition house leader, who made a very compelling case for the path that he has put forward, was the idea that, if the House is able to do incredible things to order persons to attend, we should be able to do the same with respect to documents. That is central to the arguments he made, and I just wanted to share with members a couple of citations I believe the Speaker will find helpful in making his ruling.

First of all, in their 1972 paper, entitled “Parliamentary Committees: Powers over and protection afforded to witnesses”, then Attorney General of Australia, Ivor Greenwood, and then Solicitor General of Australia, Robert Ellicott, wrote at paragraph 117:

Although seldom if ever used, it would no doubt be within the competence of the House of Commons and therefore our own Houses to authorise an officer to search for specified documents or classes of documents in a particular place and order that they be inspected or copied or brought before the House. If a committee had power conferred on it to do this there seems to be no reason why it, too, could not give such an order. Any person who obstructed an officer in the course of carrying out the order would, of course, be guilty of contempt.... We are inclined to the view that the power to give such an order is conferred on a committee by reason of a power to send for documents.

The principle of the House being empowered to search for and seize documents is also endorsed at page 688 of *Australia's House of Representatives Practice*, sixth edition, and it is also cited favourably by Derek Lee, a former Liberal member of Parliament in this House, in his 1999 book, *The Power of Parliamentary Houses to Send for Persons, Papers and Records* at page 47, where he

Privilege

adds, “Alternatively, where a person is in the sergeant's custody, the House may send the sergeant to accompany the prisoner while the prisoner goes to obtain the document required by the House, as the U.K. House of Commons did in 1809.”.

I just wanted to make sure I added those important citations to the record. I think they will be helpful to the Speaker in making his decision, and I believe it is very clear that the House does and should have the power to order the documents to be produced, just as it can order someone to attend to the bar.

• (1620)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Therrien: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Bloc Québécois, I would like to reserve the right of our party to respond to the question of privilege raised by my hon. colleague from Louis-Saint-Laurent at a later date.

[*English*]

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on this matter, I would also like to add to the body of evidence you are considering in this matter, as we had Mr. Stewart in front of our Standing Committee on Health on Friday, where he was questioned on this issue. It was very apparent in his testimony he understood the terms of the order and had decided not to abide by the second component of the order, which was the production of documents.

It is important for the Speaker, in considering his ruling in terms of a prima facie case of breach of privilege, to understand that Mr. Stewart did have the opportunity to comply with the motion, that he understood the terms of the motion and yet failed to comply today. This has made my job as a parliamentarian and the vice-chair of the Standing Committee on Health exceptionally difficult. It is our job to scrutinize these matters. I certainly feel that having the head of the Public Health Agency of Canada before the committee outlining the fact that he understood the terms of the motion yet indicating he may not comply with it to be highly problematic. Parliament is supreme. We have, as parliamentarians, the right to compel documents and to have them so we can suggest better public policy outcomes.

I would add one further point in this regard. This is now becoming a pattern. There was a motion put before the House in October for the production of other documents. That has not been complied with fully, with the health committee we are seized with. In testimony in front of the health committee, the deputy minister for Public Works also said that the government had wilfully not complied with the terms of the motion and that it had not produced unredacted documents to the law clerk. Therefore, parliamentarians have not had the ability to scrutinize these documents.

The documents I am raising right now as extra evidence are in fact contracts worth hundreds of millions of dollars, if not billions of dollars. It is difficult to ascertain because we do not have copies of them. Given that Canadians pay taxes to fund these contracts, and there have been a lot of delays in the delivery of these contracts, it is incumbent upon the committee to be able to look at these things.

Privilege

This is a pattern. I would direct the Speaker and the Clerk to the testimony of Mr. Stewart in front of the health committee on Friday, and present that as evidence that this was wilfully ignoring the will of the House. I find this deeply unacceptable and I certainly support some of the arguments that have been made by my colleagues this afternoon.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to address two relatively important but quick points.

My understanding is that the Public Health Agency of Canada has been invoking a mandatory requirement under section s.38 of the Evidence Act. This is a part of the legislation the Speaker really needs to look at as Mr. Stewart is, from what I understand, following the law. He has turned those documents over to the office of the AG from what I understand, and notice has been filed in the federal court. This is my understanding. The rule of law limits Parliament. Its powers are not completely unfettered. They are fettered by its own laws. The law is, and I really want to emphasize this, clear in section s.38 of the Evidence Act. That is the first point.

The second point, and I think I can speak on behalf of a number of my colleagues, is that having Mr. Stewart at the bar was very difficult for many of us to witness. The amount of time he stayed at the bar was deeply offensive to many members.

Can the Speaker provide, in his ruling, why it was necessary to keep this outstanding civil servant, who has done such a wonderful job during this pandemic, at the bar in such a fashion? It seemed to be somewhat, in my opinion, shameful, so I ask the Speaker to also take that into consideration when he provides the ruling.

• (1625)

Mr. Ron McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wish to respond to the comments from the member for Calgary Nose Hill regarding Mr. Stewart's appearance at the health committee on Friday.

From my recollection, Mr. Stewart did not, in fact, indicate that he would not bring forward the documents, although he did decline to say one way or the other. However, he did, most emphatically, express serious concerns that, as a public servant, he is bound to obey the laws passed by this Parliament.

The fact that Mr. Stewart did not produce these documents at this time, I would say, does not indicate any willful disregard of this House, but rather a much higher regard for the will of Parliament as a whole, which has passed the laws that he is bound to obey.

The Speaker: I want to point out that we have heard a lot, and we still have three more people getting up on this point of privilege. I want to make sure that anything that is being brought is new and concise rather than repeating what has already been said.

The next person getting up is the member for Vancouver Kingsway.

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have heard a number of members speak to an issue that I think is very important for you in assessing this ruling, and that is what

kind of fetters may or may not exist to the House's power to order documents. There was a suggestion made that government officials may validly refuse an order of production from the House if they believe that another law prevents them from doing that.

I just want to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, a letter that was sent to the Standing Committee on Health, dated March 20, 2020, signed by Philippe Dufresne, the Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel. In this letter, he said:

...we reminded the government officials that the House's and its committees' powers to order the production of records is absolute and unfettered as it constitutes a constitutional parliamentary privilege that supersedes statutory obligations.

When some of my hon. colleagues say things like that the Evidence Act, which is another statute of this House, prevents Mr. Stewart or someone else from disclosing documents, or maybe it is the National Security Act or other considerations, those are all other statutes of the House that very clearly are superseded by Parliament's constitutional authority to order the production of documents.

My final brief point is this. There seems to be a suggestion that national security would be compromised were the government to comply with your ruling, Mr. Speaker. If I am not mistaken, your ruling and the subject matter of the order do require the documents to be reviewed by the law clerk for national security reasons. The real issue here is who does that. It is the will of the House that it is the law clerk of the House of Commons who will be doing the redacting, whereas the government seems to be suggesting that it has the right to pre-redact. I think that is leading to confusion and misunderstanding among Canadians that these documents might somehow compromise national security were your ruling to be complied with, but that is not the case at all.

• (1630)

Mr. Jack Harris (St. John's East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, there is a significant point of rebuttal to the comments that were made by various people with respect to the letter of the law and other laws that are passed by Parliament. My colleague for Vancouver Kingsway has referred to the letter from the law clerk.

However, the complete rebuttal to the comments made with respect to that is actually found in the ruling of Speaker Milliken of April 27, 2010. It completely sets out the whole case, starting with what was suggested by the government House leader and then going on to explain that how it is done and the methods of doing it are to be determined by the House. All of those arguments were made before the Speaker back in 2010 and were rejected by the Speaker in making his ruling. I would suggest that this is the complete rebuttal to the comments that have been made to suggest that the order of the House, which you ruled to be in order, was in fact improper.

Government Orders

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, members of the government have been invoking this argument that the Public Health Agency is limited in the documents it can hand over, by law. We heard this argument the first time the president of the Public Health Agency appeared before a committee on March 22. He invoked the Privacy Act in his consistent refusal to answer questions or hand over information subsequently.

I have a few points on this invocation of the Privacy Act.

Number one, Mr. Speaker, you have already ruled on this question in your ruling on the initial question of privilege, so it seems that by invoking this, members are trying to undo a ruling that you have already made.

Number two, members have rightly invoked the constitutional principle that the rights of this House are part of our constitutional law and they supersede statutes like the Privacy Act. A point that has not been made, however, and that was made by my colleague from Wellington—Halton Hills at the ethics committee on March 31, when the committee first adopted an order to send for these documents, was that the Privacy Act itself contains an exception, which clarifies, in this case, that the document should be handed over. My colleague, at the time, read paragraph 8(2)(c) of the Privacy Act, which says:

(2) Subject to any other Act of Parliament, personal information under the control of a government institution may be disclosed...

(c) for the purpose of complying with a subpoena or warrant issued or order made by a court, person or body with jurisdiction to compel the production of information or for the purpose of complying with rules of court relating to the production of information;

In other words, we do not have a conflict between the constitutional principle of the supremacy of Parliament and the Privacy Act, because the Privacy Act explicitly defers to the authority of courts, of Parliament and of other bodies that have the right to send for these documents.

These arguments were made at the time, and in fact these arguments were persuasive to Liberal members of the committee. At the time, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs said:

I think the section that [the member for Wellington—Halton Hills] cited is actually more appropriate. I hope that legal counsel to the Public Health Agency of Canada will listen to [the member] on that, and investigate further the right and the responsibility of a parliamentary committee, following under the rules of the House and the purpose of the House to oversee government and its agencies. I'm not going to be arguing with [the member] on that point, as well.

Very clearly, members of the government who claim that there is some legal obligation on the part of the Public Health Agency of Canada to not hand over these documents simply are not aware of the relevant law in this case. Mr. Speaker, you have ruled, the Constitution is clear and the Privacy Act is clear that these documents should be handed over. Members of the government have consistently agreed with that view of the law at the Canada—China committee. That is why they have voted in favour of motions to send for these documents.

• (1635)

The Speaker: I want to thank the hon. members for their interventions. This is an unprecedented situation and one that concerns the Chair.

[*Translation*]

I will take the matter under advisement and get back to the House with a ruling.

* * *

[*English*]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that messages have been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed the following bills: Bill C-33, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the federal public administration for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2022; and Bill C-34, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the federal public administration for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2022.

[*Translation*]

It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Regina—Lewvan, Natural Resources; the hon. member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, National Defence; the hon. member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith, Indigenous Affairs.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2021, NO. 1

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-30, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on April 19, 2021 and other measures, as reported (with amendments) from the committee, and of Motion No. 2.

The Speaker: It being 4:35 p.m., pursuant to order made Monday, January 25, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at report stage of Bill C-30.

Call in the members.

• (1705)

(The House divided on the motion, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 159*)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra
Anandasangaree
Arya
Badawey
Bains
Battiste
Bendayan

Anand
Arseneault
Atwin
Bagnell
Baker
Beech
Bennett

Government Orders

Bessette	Bibeau		
Bittle	Blair		
Blois	Bratina		
Brière	Carr	Aboultatif	Aitchison
Casey	Chagger	Albas	Alleslev
Champagne	Chen	Allison	Angus
Cormier	Dabrusin	Arnold	Ashton
Damoff	Dhaliwal	Bachrach	Baldinelli
Dhillon	Dong	Barlow	Barrett
Drouin	Dubourg	Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Duclos	Duguid	Benzen	Bergen
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz	Bergeron	Berthold
Easter	Ehsassi	Bérubé	Bezan
El-Khoury	Ellis	Blaikie	Blanchet
Erskine-Smith	Fergus	Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Fillmore	Finnigan	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Block
Fisher	Fonseca	Boudrias	Boulerice
Fortier	Fragiskatos	Bragdon	Brassard
Fraser	Freeland	Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins
Fry	Garneau	Cannings	Carrie
Gerretsen	Gould	Chabot	Champoux
Guilbeault	Hajdu	Charbonneau	Chiu
Hardie	Holland	Chong	Cooper
Housefather	Hussen	Cumming	Dalton
Hutchings	Iacono	Dancho	Davidson
Ien	Jaczek	Davies	DeBellefeuille
Joly	Jones	Deltell	d'Entremont
Jordan	Jowhari	Desbiens	Desilets
Kelloway	Khalid	Diotte	Doherty
Khera	Koutrakis	Dowdall	Dreeschen
Kusmierczyk	Lalonde	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Duvall
Lambropoulos	Lametti	Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Lamoureux	Lattanzio	Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Lauzon	LeBlanc	Findlay	Fortin
Lebouthillier	Lefebvre	Gallant	Garrison
Lightbound	Long	Gaudreau	Gazan
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	Généreux	Genuis
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Gill	Gladu
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada	Godin	Gourde
May (Cambridge)	McCrimmon	Gray	Green
McDonald	McGuinty	Hallan	Harder
McKay	McKenna	Harris	Hoback
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Hughes	Jansen
Mendès	Mendicino	Jeneroux	Johns
Miller	Monsef	Julian	Kelly
Morrissey	Murray	Kent	Kitchen
Ng	O'Connell	Kmiec	Kram
Oliphant	O'Regan	Kurek	Kusie
Petitpas Taylor	Powlowski	Kwan	Lake
Qualtrough	Ratansi	Larouche	Lawrence
Regan	Robillard	Lehoux	Lemire
Rodriguez	Rogers	Lewis (Essex)	Liepert
Romanado	Sahota (Brampton North)	Lloyd	Lobb
Saini	Sajjan	Lukiwski	MacGregor
Saks	Samson	MacKenzie	Maguire
Sangha	Sarai	Manly	Marcil
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke	Martel	Masse
Schulte	Serré	Mathysen	Mazier
Sgro	Shanahan	McCauley (Edmonton West)	McColeman
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)	McLean	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simms	McPherson	Melillo
Sorbara	Spengemann	Michaud	Moore
Tabbara	Tassi	Morantz	Morrison
Trudeau	Turnbull	Motz	Nater
Van Bynen	van Koeverden	Normandin	O'Toole
Vandal	Vandenbeld	Patzer	Paul-Hus
Vaughan	Virani	Pauzé	Perron
Weiler	Wilkinson	Plamondon	Poilevre
Yip	Young	Qaqqaq	Rayes
Zahid	Zann	Redekopp	Reid
Zuberi— 155		Rempel Garner	Richards
		Rood	Ruff
		Sahota (Calgary Skyview)	Saroya

NAYS**Members**

Government Orders

Savard-Tremblay
Schmale
Shin
Simard
Sloan
Stanton
Ste-Marie
Stubbs
Thériault
Tochor
Uppal
Vecchio
Viersen
Vis
Warkentin
Webber
Wilson-Raybould
Yurdiga

Scheer
Shields
Shipley
Singh
Soroka
Steinley
Strahl
Sweet
Therrien
Trudel
Van Popta
Vidal
Vignola
Wagantall
Waugh
Williamson
Wong
Zimmer— 176

Damoff
DeBellefeuille
Desilets
Dhillon
Drouin
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Garneau
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Gould
Guilbeault
Hardie
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Ien
Johns
Jones
Jowhari
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lametti
Larouche
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Lemire
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacGregor
Maloney
Marcil
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Mendicino
Miller
Morrissey
Ng
O'Connell
O'Regan
Perron
Plamondon
Qaqqaq
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Sahota (Brampton North)
Sajjan
Samson
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Tassi

Davies
Desbiens
Dhaliwal
Dong
Dubourg
Duguid
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Fergus
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fry
Garrison
Gazan
Gill
Green
Hajdu
Harris
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Jaczek
Joly
Jordan
Julian
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Lefebvre
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Manly
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendès
Michaud
Monsef
Murray
Normandin
Oliphant
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Powlowski
Qualtrough
Regan
Rodriguez
Romanado
Saini
Saks
Sangha
Savard-Tremblay
Schieffe
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Singh
Spengemann
Tabbara
Thériault

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Mona Fortier (for the Hon. Chrystia Freeland) moved:

That Bill C-30, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on April 19, 2021 and other measures, as amended, be concurred in at report stage.

[*English*]

The Speaker: If a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes to request a recorded division or that the motion be adopted on division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a recorded division.

• (1715)

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 160*)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bagnell
Baker
Battiste
Beech
Bennett
Bérubé
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blanchet
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boudrias
Bratina
Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr
Chabot
Champagne
Charbonneau
Cormier

Anand
Angus
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Bains
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bendayan
Bergeron
Bessette
Bittle
Blair
Blanchette-Joncas
Blois
Boulerice
Brière
Cannings
Casey
Chagger
Champoux
Chen
Dabrusin

Routine Proceedings

Therrien	Trudeau
Trudel	Turnbull
Van Bynen	van Koeverden
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Vignola
Virani	Weiler
Wilkinson	Wilson-Raybould
Yip	Young
Zahid	Zann
Zuberi— 211	

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Alleslev
Allison	Arnold
Baldinelli	Barlow
Barrett	Benzen
Bergen	Berthold
Bezan	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Calkins
Carrie	Chiu
Chong	Cooper
Cumming	Dalton
Dancho	Davidson
Deltell	d'Entremont
Diotte	Doherty
Dowdall	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Fast	Findlay
Gallant	Généreux
Genuis	Gladu
Godin	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Harder	Hoback
Jansen	Jeneroux
Kelly	Kent
Kitchen	Kmiec
Kram	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Lawrence	Lehoux
Lewis (Essex)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Lukiwski	MacKenzie
Maguire	Martel
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McColeman	McLean
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Melillo
Moore	Morantz
Morrison	Motz
Nater	O'Toole
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Poilievre	Rayes
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Rood	Ruff
Sahota (Calgary Skyview)	Saroya
Scheer	Schmale
Shields	Shin
Shipley	Sloan
Soroka	Stanton
Steinley	Strahl
Stubbs	Sweet
Tochor	Uppal
Van Popta	Vecchio
Vidal	Viersen
Vis	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Williamson
Wong	Yurdiga

Zimmer— 119

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried. When shall the bill be read a third time?

[Translation]

At the next sitting of the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[English]

I wish to inform the House that because of the deferred recorded divisions, Government Orders will be extended by 25 minutes.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Ms. Rachel Bendayan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Small Business, Export Promotion and International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2) and in accordance with the requirements for greater transparency set out in the updated policy on the tabling of treaties in Parliament, it gives me great pleasure to inform the House of Commons that the government plans to begin negotiations toward a comprehensive economic partnership agreement between Canada and Indonesia.

The Government of Canada plans to go ahead with a first round of negotiations with Indonesia not less than 90 days from the date of this notice.

* * *

● (1720)

[English]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8)(a), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 19 petitions. These returns will be tabled in an electronic format.

* * *

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

Mr. Scott Simms (Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1), I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the report of the Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association respecting its participation at the second part of the 2021 ordinary session of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe via video conference from April 19 to April 22.

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Ms. Ruby Sahota (Brampton North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 19th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs in relation to Bill C-19, an act to amend the Canada Elections Act (COVID-19 response).

The committee has studied the bill and has decided to report the bill back to the House with amendments.

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Mr. Pat Finnigan (Miramichi—Grand Lake, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the seventh report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food in relation to Bill C-205, an act to amend the Health of Animals Act.

[Translation]

The committee has studied the bill and has decided to report the bill back to the House with amendments.

[English]

INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Mrs. Sherry Romanado (Longueuil—Charles-LeMoyne, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the seventh report of the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology, entitled “Affordability and Accessibility of Telecommunications Services in Canada: Encouraging Competition to (Finally) Bridge the Digital Divide”.

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this report.

[Translation]

I also have the honour to present, in both official languages, the eighth report of the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology in relation to Bill C-253, an act to amend the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act regarding pension plans and group insurance plans.

The committee has studied the bill and has decided to report the bill back to the House with an amendment.

[English]

HUMAN RESOURCES, SKILLS AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Mr. Sean Casey (Charlottetown, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the seventh report of the Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities in relation to Bill C-265, an act to amend the Employment Insurance Act (illness, injury or quarantine).

[Translation]

The committee has studied the bill and has decided to report it back to the House without amendment.

Routine Proceedings

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Sven Spengemann (Mississauga—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the ninth report of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development, entitled, “Assessing Risk, Preventing Diversion and Increasing Transparency: Strengthening Canada’s Arms Export Controls in a Volatile World”.

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this report.

Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to quickly thank the entire House of Commons team, including the clerk, the analysts, the interpreters and the technicians. I thank them for their exemplary service.

● (1725)

[English]

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as has become a pattern now, with two reports back-to-back at the Foreign Affairs committee, we have a supplementary report from a majority of members of the committee. Conservatives, New Democrats and Bloc members, because of the potential of things being drawn out, found it most effective to put the will of the majority of the committee and a variety of recommendations, as well as evidence not reflected in the main report, into a supplementary report.

This supplementary report reflects the views and concerns of members of the Conservative Party, the Bloc and the NDP. We are pleased to submit that joint supplementary report together.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Mrs. Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the following two reports of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts. The 23rd report is entitled “National Shipbuilding Strategy”, and the 24th report is entitled “Procuring Complex Information Technology Solutions”. Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to each of these two reports.

I would like to echo the comments of my colleague who previously gave thanks and send my thanks to the analysts and the clerk for the excellent work they have done during this session.

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Mr. Ken Hardie (Fleetwood—Port Kells, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans, entitled “Pacific Salmon: Ensuring the Long-Term Health of Wild Populations and Associated Fisheries”. This report complements our committee’s 2019 study, “West Coast Fisheries: Sharing Risks and Benefits”, which recommended actions to ensure equitable access to Canada’s common resource. This report today recommends steps to ensure there will be wild salmon to catch.

I would like to echo the comments of my colleagues in thanking our analysts for preparing an excellent report. Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this report.

Routine Proceedings

Mr. Mel Arnold (North Okanagan—Shuswap, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise to present a complementary report to the report on Pacific salmon.

• (1730)

As the fisheries committee has studied the state of Pacific salmon over the past 15 months, the evidence we received has consistently pointed us to the stark and inescapable conclusion that the vast majority of Pacific salmon stocks continue to decline toward the point of no return. Throughout this study, the committee has heard of the many threats our Pacific salmon face and witnesses have also identified real, viable solutions that have been provided to the government through DFO, but the government has failed to take timely and effective actions to restore and protect Pacific salmon.

Time after time, the committee heard how the government had ignored proposals for actions that could restore and protect Pacific salmon. In the past year alone, the future of over 10,000 jobs in British Columbia has been cast into great uncertainty and insecurity because the government continues to announce decisions without genuine consultations. It continues to issue decisions that put British Columbian jobs on notice without providing any transition plan for the workers, families and communities affected.

British Columbia's salmon economy is in great peril and this peril will only increase unless the government discards its failed approaches. Money alone cannot reverse the declines. The government must ensure that federal resources are attached to timely and effective plans, management and actions to save our Pacific salmon. Pacific salmon will not survive more of the Liberals' status quo. The time for action and change is now.

* * *

NATIONAL RENEWABLE ENERGY STRATEGY ACT

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-318, An Act respecting the development of a national renewable energy strategy.

He said: Madam Speaker, I am honoured to introduce the national renewable energy strategy bill. I would like to thank my colleague, the hon. member for Vancouver East, for seconding this legislation and for her tireless advocacy in support of environmental justice.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has been clear that we must cut global greenhouse gas emissions by 45% by 2030 and reach net zero by 2050 to avert catastrophic climate change. We need real action now. That means implementing solutions for clean energy and transitioning away from a fossil fuel economy.

While we do this, we must ensure that workers are not left behind. Jobs in the clean energy sector are projected to grow nearly four times faster than the Canadian average by 2030, and the industry's GDP contribution is set to grow at more than double the national average.

This legislation would accelerate Canada's transition to a clean energy future by requiring that the Minister of Natural Resources develop and implement a national strategy to ensure 100% of electricity generated in Canada comes from renewable energy sources by 2030.

I call on all parliamentarians to support this vital initiative for our country and our planet.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)

* * *

• (1735)

[*Translation*]

PETITIONS

ROAD SAFETY

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Madam Speaker, accidents keep happening at the intersection of Chemin du Grand-Rang and Highway 116 in Sainte-Marie-Madeleine. Several of them have been, are and will be fatal. This intersection is dangerous due to the alignment of the railway, which is a federal responsibility.

Unfortunately, Transport Canada and Canadian National have wilfully ignored calls for help. Those in charge of these two institutions have to answer the call. Every day that passes, lives are at risk, and the people driving on that road are terrified.

Today, my thoughts are with the victims and their families and loved ones. It is on their behalf that I present this petition, signed by 1,200 concerned citizens who are asserting their right to safe roads.

[*English*]

MARIJUANA FRAMEWORK

Mrs. Tamara Jansen (Cloverdale—Langley City, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is my honour to rise in the House today to present petitions on behalf of constituents and Canadians across the country.

The first petition has to do with the abdication of responsibility by Health Canada under the Liberal government when it comes to issues with the marijuana framework.

The petitioners are asking the government to immediately close the loopholes that allow facilities linked to organized crime to grow marijuana in our communities, and to provide law enforcement agencies with the tools they need to investigate and prosecute these unlawful operations.

ETHIOPIA

Mrs. Tamara Jansen (Cloverdale—Langley City, CPC): Madam Speaker, the second petition calls on the government to take meaningful action to address the conflict in the Tigray region of Ethiopia. Civilians are being subjected to human rights abuses and are being blocked from accessing humanitarian aid.

The petitioners are asking the government to immediately work with the Ethiopian and Eritrean governments to end the violence and promote democracy and the rule of law. It is in such a time as this that the world needs Canada to have a principled foreign policy.

AIRLINE INDUSTRY

Mrs. Tamara Jansen (Cloverdale—Langley City, CPC): Madam Speaker, the third petition I will present today calls on the government to provide sector-specific support to the airline sector, with the conditions that airlines expeditiously issue refunds to passengers. Many of my constituents have been in touch with my office for well over a year and still have not received a refund.

The government has a responsibility to ensure that the support it provides to large companies goes to those who need it and not in the pockets of wealthy executives.

CONVERSION THERAPY

Mrs. Tamara Jansen (Cloverdale—Langley City, CPC): Madam Speaker, the final petition I will present today addresses Bill C-6. As I have always said, I support banning conversion therapy, as do these petitioners. The petitioners recognize, however, that the poor and imprecise definition of conversion therapy in Bill C-6 will cause this bill to ban more than just conversion therapy, including counsel from religious leaders on sexuality and the rights of parents to protect and guide their children. It is important we protect parental rights as well as the rights of Canadians to choose the type of support that is right for them.

RAILWAY SAFETY

Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill—Keewatinook Aski, NDP): Madam Speaker, I present two petitions today in the pursuit of justice for Dylan Paradis, Andrew Dockrell and Daniel Waldenberger-Bulmer, rail workers killed on the job in British Columbia in 2019. The tragic circumstances of that night were made even worse by the botched company investigation that followed. Their families, rail workers and working people deserve justice and change.

Today's CBC News story makes clear the grotesque level of complicity between the government, the TSB and CP Rail. It is clear the current system is designed to protect corporate interests, not the safety of workers and the public interest. Railways cannot be allowed to police themselves. TSB investigators like Don Crawford must be able to do their jobs independently of meddling from private companies. They must be properly protected from interference.

The two petitions presented today are signed by hundreds of Canadians. The first one calls on the government to launch an inquiry into the causes and consequences of Canada's private railway self-investigations and bring this grave injustice to light.

The second petition calls for Transportation Safety Board investigators to be granted the authority to refer potential criminal violations to proper independent police forces and to protect them as eligible whistle-blowers under the Public Servants Disclosure Protection Act. This is all in the pursuit of justice.

Routine Proceedings

• (1740)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I want to remind the hon. member to maybe adjust her microphone next time so it is a bit higher. There was a lot of interference.

The hon. member for Nepean.

HIDDEN DISABILITY SYMBOL

Mr. Chandra Arya (Nepean, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the hidden disability community in Canada is growing and there is a need for a hidden disability symbol as it can act as a tool for self-advocacy, increasing social awareness and support.

I wish to present a petition that calls upon the Government of Canada to adopt and promote a national hidden disability symbol. It also calls upon the government to lead or participate in actions toward the symbol's international adoption.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Paul Manly (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, GP): Madam Speaker, I have two petitions today.

It is a privilege to table e-petition 3433, with 1,139 signatures from Canadians across the country.

The petitioners are concerned about the government's plan to purchase 88 new fighter jets for a cost of \$19 billion, with an estimated full life-cycle cost of \$76.8 billion. They note that this purchase will divert funding from other critical areas and that these jets are weapons of aggression rather than defence. They also note that the Department of National Defence is the largest emitter of greenhouse gases among all federal departments, but that operations are exempt from the federal government's GHG emission reduction plan.

The petitioners call upon the House of Commons to cancel the \$19-billion competition to purchase the 88 new combat aircraft; include all the carbon emissions from the Department of National Defence's military vehicles and operations in the federal government's GHG emission reduction plan and net-zero plan; and invest in a conversion plan that will create thousands of jobs in the green economy and the care economy to help transition Canada away from fossil fuels, and that will be enforced.

FORESTRY INDUSTRY

Mr. Paul Manly (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, GP): Madam Speaker, it is an honour to table a second petition on National Indigenous Peoples Day in Canada. The petitioners note that indigenous people have rights and title to their traditional territories and have been stewards of these lands since time immemorial.

First nations and indigenous land defenders are calling for the protection of the remaining 2.7% of the original high productivity old-growth forests in British Columbia, 75% of which are slated to be logged.

Routine Proceedings

The petitioners call upon the government to work with the provinces and the first nations to immediately halt logging of endangered old-growth ecosystems; fund the long-term protection of old-growth ecosystems as a priority for Canada's climate action plan and reconciliation with indigenous peoples; support value-added forestry initiatives in partnership with first nations to ensure Canada's forestry industry is sustainable and based on the harvesting of second- and third-growth forests; ban the export of raw logs and maximize resource use for local jobs; and ban the use of whole trees for wood pellet biofuel production.

ALBERTA

Mr. Michael Cooper (St. Albert—Edmonton, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is an honour to present a petition on behalf of Canadians.

The petitioners wish to draw the House's attention to the fact that Alberta has one of the highest unemployment rates in Canada and, in particular, many young men are out of work. They further wish to draw the House's attention to the connection between a paycheque and one's self-worth. They highlight the impact that this can have on the mental health and well-being of many unemployed Albertans.

Therefore, the petitioners call on the Government of Canada to work with local organizations, the Government of Alberta and businesses to see Alberta's unemployment reduced to help those who are in need, and for the government to immediately set up a 988 national suicide hotline.

JUSTICE

Mr. Randall Garrison (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke, NDP): Madam Speaker, it is my honour to table two e-petitions today.

The first is e-petition 3411, which was signed by more than 1,000 Canadians and calls on the government to act quickly on the recommendations from the justice committee report, entitled "The Shadow Pandemic: Stopping Coercive and Controlling Behaviour in Intimate Partner Relationships". Signatories ask the government to recognize the urgency of legislation to add coercive and controlling behaviour to the Criminal Code, to recognize that this behaviour is in itself a form of violence and to recognize that coercive and controlling behaviour, more often than not, is a precursor to more direct forms of violence.

• (1745)

CHILD ABDUCTION

Mr. Randall Garrison (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke, NDP): Madam Speaker, the second petition, e-petition 3412, was signed by more than 600 Canadians, and it asks for the government to support Alexis Smecher, who has not seen his young daughter since November 2019, after she was abducted and taken to Paraguay by her mother despite a B.C. court order requiring joint parenting. Unfortunately, this case is but one example among dozens where parents are denied their parental rights and contact with their children as a result of international abductions.

The signatories call on the government to engage directly with Paraguay and with the Inter-American Court of Human Rights to get Mr. Smecher's daughter brought back to Canada expeditiously,

to offer him every assistance and to keep him informed of the progress on his case.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Patrick Weiler (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, Lib.): Madam Speaker, today I have the honour to present petition 114-11264. This petition was initiated by a young leader from the Kootenays and has been signed by many constituents in my riding. The petition notes that we are living in a climate crisis and that industrial activities have caused destruction to ecosystems around the world by activities permitted by law. The international community lacks a legal framework ensuring shared nation responsibility for humanitarian and environmental aid and, as a UN member state, Canada shares in a collective legal duty to promote social progress and better standards of life globally.

The petitioners call on the federal government to declare its support for, and to advocate international adoption of, an amendment to its own statute of the International Criminal Court to include ecocide as a crime, which would provide a simple, effective deterrent to large-scale ecosystem destruction for those in positions of corporate and financial responsibility, and mandate a duty to protect for government officials enforceable within existing criminal justice systems.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, the first petition is on a subject that is near and dear to my heart. It is on Pakistan's blasphemy law. Both my wife's parents were born in Pakistan, and I know from hearing stories and concerns from the Pakistani-Christian community and other minority communities that there are significant concerns about the blasphemy law and how it disproportionately targets religious minorities and people involved in personal disputes, and applies grossly disproportionate penalties to innocent people.

Petitioners call on the Government of Canada to strongly advocate for the repeal or reform of Pakistan's blasphemy law.

• (1750)

INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, the second petition reflects concerns I have been hearing from many different stakeholders about the direction and control system as it exists within the Income Tax Act.

Petitioners note direction and control requires the use of resources by various organizations. It is cumbersome, resource-intensive and adds unnecessary administrative burdens. Also, in the context of international development, it makes it very difficult for organizations to work in the most effective way possible in partnership with local communities because these regulations require all projects to be under the control of the Canadian entity.

Petitioners further note that the first report of the Advisory Committee on the Charitable Sector, made up of 14 sector members, recommends that the Minister of National Revenue work with the Minister of Finance to address the problems associated with the current system. Also, the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development had a unanimous recommendation calling on the government to fix the direction and control system.

Therefore, petitioners call on the government to replace the original regime and “own activities” test in the Income Tax Act, which requires registered charities to devote all their resources to charitable-sector activities carried out by themselves, with a regime that permits registered charities to operate and further their charitable purpose, and to replace current administrative requirements around direction and control with a requirement for registered charities to establish reasonable and practical parameters for ensuring resource accountability when working to achieve a charitable purpose through a third party that is not a qualified donee.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, the third petition I am presenting is from Canadians who are very concerned about Bill C-10: the government's supposed reform of the Broadcasting Act, which would in reality give the government significant powers to control and limit speech online.

Petitioners note that Liberal members of the committee voted in favour of amendments that would include social media platforms within the jurisdiction of this regulation. Petitioners call on the Government of Canada to respect Canadians' fundamental right to freedom of expression, to prevent Internet censorship in Canada and not to continue with Bill C-10 as currently written.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, the next petition I am tabling highlights the challenges experienced by the Christian community in Nigeria, whereas the escalation of extremist violence targeting Christians in Nigeria has led a growing number of experts to suggest that Christians in some parts of the country are facing an ongoing genocide. Petitioners call on the Government of Canada to step up its efforts to defend the rights and security of Christians in Nigeria.

HUMAN ORGAN TRAFFICKING

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, the next petition I am tabling is in support of Bill S-204, a bill that would make it a criminal offence for a person to go abroad and receive an organ without consent. This bill was debated on Friday. Unfortunately, we did not have the support of the government to expedite it at that time, but hopefully that support will be forthcoming very soon. Petitioners want to see this Parliament be the one that gets Bill S-204 passed.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and to the Leader of the Govern-

Routine Proceedings

ment in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 734 to 739.

[Text]

Question No. 734—**Mr. Garnett Genuis:**

With regard to Canadian aid to Burma and the need to enforce the economic sanctions on Burmese military officials: (a) how is the funding from the Joint Peace Fund being allocated since the military coup in February 2021; (b) is any funding being directed to or through state or military-controlled channels, and, if so, what are the details, including the amounts; (c) what is the general breakdown of how Canadian aid dollars for Burma are being distributed and to whom; (d) does the government consider lobbying on behalf of the military regime in Burma a contravention of the Special Economic Measures (Burma) Regulations; and (e) is the government investigating or did it investigate Ari Ben-Menashe of Dickens & Madson (Canada) Inc. for a possible contravention of the Special Economic Measures (Burma) Regulations, and, if so, what is the status of the investigation?

Hon. Karina Gould (Minister of International Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the following reflects a consolidated response approved on behalf of Global Affairs Canada ministers.

In response to (a), the Joint Peace Fund, a multi-party trust fund managed by the United Nations Office for Project Services, UNOPS, was supporting two grants that brought together the civilian government and the Tatmadaw, the National Reconciliation and Peace Center, NRPC, and the Joint Ceasefire Monitoring Committee, JMC, to support the peace process in Myanmar. These two grants have been suspended following the coup d'état. This decision was taken based on recommendations from the funding board, of which Canada is a member. New funding for civil society organizations will continue on a case-by-case basis based on the terms of reference for the fund.

In response to (b), Canada does not and will not provide direct funding to the Government of Myanmar.

In response to (c), under its initial comprehensive strategy to respond to the Rohingya crisis, Canada dedicated \$300 million over three years, 2018-21, to alleviate the humanitarian crisis, support impacted host communities in Bangladesh, encourage positive political developments in Myanmar, ensure accountability for the crimes committed, and enhance international co-operation.

This has been achieved with the help of strong and trusted partners, ranging from multilateral to international, Canadian and local organizations, such as the World Bank, the United Nations Development Programme, UNDP, the United Nations Office for Project Services, UNOPS, Inter Pares, Mennonite Economic Development Associates, MEDA, the International Development Research Centre, IDRC, and the Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee, BRAC.

As of March 31, 2021, Canada has spent the full amount of \$300 million dedicated towards Canada's strategy to respond to the Rohingya crisis.

Routine Proceedings

Budget 2021 proposed that Canada dedicate \$288 million over three years, 2021-24, to further respond to this humanitarian crisis, encourage positive political developments, ensure accountability for the crimes committed, and enhance international co-operation. This investment is part of Canada's ongoing efforts to address the evolving crisis in Myanmar and the ongoing refugee crisis in Bangladesh.

In response to (d), Canada first imposed sanctions in relation to Myanmar under the special economic measures, Burma, regulations, on December 13, 2007, in order to respond to the gravity of the human rights and humanitarian situation in Myanmar, which threatened peace and security in the region.

On February 18, 2021, in response to the coup d'état in Myanmar perpetrated against the democratically elected National League for Democracy government on February 1, 2021, the regulations were amended to add nine additional individuals to the schedule in the regulations. These individuals, who are all senior officials in Myanmar's military, were either directly involved in the coup as part of the National Defence and Security Council, or are members of the military regime's new governing body, the State Administration Council. Most recently, on May 17, 2021, Canada announced additional sanctions against 16 individuals and 10 entities under the special economic measures, Burma, regulations in response to the military's ongoing brutal repression of the people of Myanmar and their refusal to take steps to restore democracy. Canada will continue to review the need for further sanctions as appropriate.

Canada's sanctions related to Myanmar consist of an arms embargo and a dealings ban on listed persons, including individuals and entities. With respect to the arms embargo, the regulations prohibit persons in Canada or Canadians outside Canada from exporting or importing arms and related material to or from Myanmar. It is also prohibited to communicate technical data, or provide or acquire financial or other services, in relation to military activities or to the provision, maintenance, or use of arms and related material.

With regard to the dealings ban, the regulations prohibit any person in Canada or Canadian outside Canada from engaging in any activity related to any property, wherever situated, held by or on behalf of a listed person, or from providing any financial or related service or entering into or facilitating any transaction in relation to such an activity. It is also prohibited to make any goods available to a listed person or provide any financial or related service to them or for their benefit.

In response to (e), contravening Canadian sanctions is a criminal offence. All persons in Canada and Canadians abroad must comply with Canada's strict sanctions measures, including individuals and entities. Possible violations and offences related to Canada's sanctions are investigated and enforced by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the Canada Border Services Agency.

Question No. 735—Mr. Paul Manly:

With regard to the government's acquisition of 88 advanced fighter aircraft for the Royal Canadian Air Force: (a) in what month are the successful bidder and aircraft expected to be chosen by the government; (b) in what month is a contract expected to be signed with the chosen bidder; (c) will the government conduct a revised cost analysis of the acquisition, and, if so, (i) when will the analysis be conducted, (ii) will the analysis be made public, and, if so, when; and (d) will the government sign the contract before the Parliamentary Budget Officer's cost analysis of the acquisition is completed and made public?

Ms. Anita Vandenberg (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as outlined in Canada's defence policy, "Strong, Secure, Engaged", a modern fighter aircraft fleet is essential for defending Canada and Canadian sovereignty and contributing to our NORAD and NATO commitments, now and in the future.

That is why on December 12, 2017, the government launched an open, fair and transparent competition to permanently replace Canada's fighter fleet with 88 advanced fighter aircraft. This project will provide a modern fighter capability to the Royal Canadian Air Force, ensuring that it maintains the ability to meet complex and evolving threats.

This project will leverage Canadian capabilities while supporting the growth of Canada's aerospace and defence industries for decades.

In response to parts (a) and (b), the Government of Canada is currently evaluating proposals for the future fighter capability project from the three eligible bidders. Selection of the successful bidder is anticipated in early 2022, at which time the Government of Canada will enter into discussions with the selected bidder to finalize the resulting contracts. A contract is expected to be awarded in late 2022.

The COVID-19 pandemic has impacted the project timelines, with further impacts being possible. National Defence anticipates having more precise timelines at the completion of the proposal evaluation phase.

In response to parts (c)(i) and (c)(ii), the Government of Canada is currently evaluating the costs of acquisition of the future fighter capability project, as it is evaluating the proposals submitted by the bidders.

Contract values will be made public, once an evaluation of costs is completed and a decision is made on the acquisition of a replacement fighter aircraft fleet.

In response to part (d), the Government of Canada will sign the contract once the future fighter capability project solicitation process has been concluded and appropriate approvals have been granted by Treasury Board.

Question No. 736—Mr. Rob Morrison:

With regard to the 2021 Census soundtrack: (a) who decided what songs would be included on the soundtrack and what criteria was used to decide which songs would be included; (b) how much is the government paying Spotify and YouTube for the services related to the playlist; (c) what are the details of how artists on the soundtrack are being remunerated for their songs, including the total amount being paid to artists for their songs being on the soundtrack; and (d) what are the costs incurred by the government to create and maintain the soundtrack website, broken down by line item?

Routine Proceedings

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in response to (a), the songs included in the 2021 census soundtrack were curated by members of Statistics Canada's census communications team as part of the engagement activities with Canadians for the 2021 census. Once initial lists were compiled, they were distributed internally to a larger group to validate that selections were reflective of the overarching aim of the project. Once the lists had been reviewed internally, they were approved by census communications senior management.

The selection criteria were as follows: performed by Canadian artists, both main artist and featured artists, where relevant; reflective of Canadian culture and diversity, which was accounted for by developing 11 unique playlists; could not focus on, or make reference to, controversial or derogatory subject matter; non-partisan in nature; clean versions of the original track, no explicit lyrics.

In response to (b), Statistics Canada has procured a six-month Spotify Premium subscription, at a cost of \$9.99 per month, for a total of \$59.94 plus applicable taxes. The Statistics Canada YouTube Music channel was already existent and Statistics Canada has not paid anything to use YouTube Music.

In response to (c), the Government of Canada does not directly compensate artists for their songs, since they are remunerated by Spotify and YouTube through their own contracts. Any songs that have already been uploaded to either platform are available to be included in public lists to listen to and share at no cost. It is a common practice on these platforms and thousands of users create and share their favorite playlists.

In response to (d), the Spotify subscription is \$9.99 per month for six months, for a total of \$59.94 plus applicable taxes. Regarding the internal labour costs, 30 hours were spent on coordinating the playlists, developing the web content, coordinating with internal teams, and performing maintenance operations. These services were performed at the rate of \$25.68 per hour, for a total of \$770.40.

The 2021 census soundtrack web page, available at <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2021/ref/soundtrack-bandesonore/index-eng.htm>, accumulated 52,177 unique visitors since its launch on April 20, 2021.

Question No. 737—Mr. Rob Morrison:

With regard to the Minister of Foreign Affairs' trip to the United Kingdom (UK) in early May 2021, and to the Prime Minister's comments made on January 29, 2021, in relation to the hotel quarantine requirements for international travellers, that "travellers will then have to wait for up to three days at an approved hotel for their tests results at their own expense": (a) did the minister and his entourage pay for their approved hotel quarantine rooms at their own expense; and (b) did the government cover or reimburse the costs of the rooms for the minister and his entourage during his trip to the UK, and, if so, what were the total costs related to the hotel stays that were paid for by the government, broken down by line item?

Mr. Robert Oliphant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the following reflects a consolidated response approved on behalf of Global Affairs Canada ministers.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs participated as the head of the Canadian delegation to the G7 Foreign and Development Ministers' Meeting in London, United Kingdom, May 3-5, 2021. In addition

to the minister, the Canadian delegation was comprised of the following: the G7 political director and assistant deputy minister, international security and political affairs; the director of communications, office of the minister of foreign affairs; the deputy director, G7/G20 summits division; and a protocol visits officer.

With regard to parts (a) and (b), the cost for official travel is covered by the international conference allotment managed by Global Affairs, per usual practice for Canadian representation at multilateral meetings.

The preparation of an accurate and comprehensive summary of expenses for participation of the Canadian delegation is in progress.

Once the related invoices and claims are finalized, travel expenses incurred by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the associate deputy minister and the director of communications will be publicly disclosed on the disclosure of travel and hospitality expenses website at www.international.gc.ca/gac-amc/publications/transparence-transparence/travel_hospitality-voyage_accueil.aspx?lang=eng.

Additionally, the department publishes expenditures for Canadian representation at international conferences and meetings and travel expenditures for Canadian representation at international conferences and meetings online annually, in Public Accounts at www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/recgen/cpc-pac/index-eng.html.

Question No. 738—Mr. Rob Morrison:

With regard to the statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on May 4, 2021, that "victims of fraud will not be held responsible for the amounts paid to people who stole their identity" in relation to the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) asking victims of identity theft to pay taxes on payments they never received: (a) what specific measures are in place to ensure that CRA does not ask identity theft victims to pay taxes on money they never received; (b) when and by what means was the directive outlined in the Prime Minister's statement provided to CRA officials; and (c) what punitive measures are in place for CRA officials who ignore the directive and continue to ask victims to pay taxes on payments they never received?

Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the CRA recognizes that there is a significant financial and emotional impact for victims of identity theft and is doing its part to detect, address and prevent transactions associated with identity theft.

Routine Proceedings

With regard to the premise of the above-noted question, it is important to note that the guiding principles of the CRA's People First philosophy provide a framework for expected behaviours at all levels within the CRA. This includes helping people understand and meet their obligations and responsibilities, and ensuring its decisions are grounded in quality information, fairness, integrity and engagement.

With regard to part (a), as part of the identity protective services, IPS, the CRA will contact taxpayers by telephone in order to support them through the process. The CRA will verify the information on their account, and adjust the accounting as required. In addition, the CRA will ensure that proper protection and corrective actions are taken thereby returning the taxpayer to a seamless interaction with the CRA. If all requested information has been provided to the IPS program and the taxpayer still received a T4A, the taxpayer is encouraged to contact their dedicated officer in order to ensure that the matter is promptly corrected.

The CRA encourages taxpayers who receive a T4A or RL-1 slip from the CRA, for Canada emergency response benefit, CERB, payments which they did not claim, to contact the CRA as soon as possible.

The CRA is prioritizing the calls it receives concerning fraud and identity theft, ensuring that they are being answered as quickly as possible.

When a taxpayer calls the CRA's individual tax enquiries, ITE, phone line to report a T4A slip that includes amounts for which they did not apply, including amounts relating to CERB, Canada emergency student benefit, CESB, Canada recovery benefit, CRB, Canada recovery caregiving benefit, CRCB, or Canada recovery sickness benefit, CRSB, ITE contact centre agents will triage the call depending on whether the taxpayer has already been identified as a potential victim of identity theft.

If the taxpayer needs to file their tax return before the T4A slip is corrected or deleted, the ITE agent will advise them to report the emergency or recovery benefit income that they actually received, if any, minus amounts they repaid in the same year. The agent will update the taxpayer's file with a notepad entry to explain that the taxpayer will report a different amount than what is reported on their T4A slip to prevent the taxpayer from being asked for this same information at a later date.

Taxpayers who are confirmed victims of identity fraud will not be held responsible for any money paid out to scammers using their identity, including taxes on those amounts, and the CRA remains dedicated to resolving these incidents. Their T4A slip or RL-1 slip will be corrected as required. Once the issue has been resolved, an amended slip will be issued.

Should a discrepancy exist between the amounts reported by a taxpayer on their tax return, and the T4A slip on file, the CRA has ensured that its system will not automatically add this income to taxpayers' accounts.

The CRA has robust systems and tools in place to monitor, detect and investigate potential threats, and to neutralize threats when they occur. As scammers adapt their practices, the CRA adjusts to introduce new measures and controls to address suspicious activity.

Where appropriate, the CRA works with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the Canadian Anti-Fraud Centre, CAFC, financial institutions and local police. In many cases, the CRA will also provide the taxpayer with credit protection and monitoring services.

With regard to part (b), the CRA can confirm the position that taxpayers who are confirmed victims of identity fraud will not be held responsible for any money paid out to scammers, including taxes on those amounts, using their identity and the CRA remains dedicated to resolving these incidents. The CRA is responsible for ensuring that all income, deductions and credits an individual claims are accurately reported and substantiated.

With regard to part (c) the CRA has robust policies and procedures in place, as well as training and quality assurance functions, to ensure that CRA interactions with its clients are conducted consistently, accurately, and with empathy and respect.

Question No. 739—Mr. Larry Maguire:

With regard to Canadian Armed Forces members operating in Iraq between December 2015 to present: (a) how many Canadian Armed Forces members were injured; (b) how many of these members were injured as a result of attacks; (c) what was the nature of each injury; (d) what was the cause of each injury; (e) how many of these injured members received a military decoration as a result of their injury, broken down by type of decoration; and (f) how many of these injured members were repatriated to Canada as a result of their injury?

Ms. Anita Vandenberg (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the care and support of ill and injured military members and their families remains a priority for National Defence.

The Canadian Armed Forces is dedicated to ensuring that every ill and injured member receives high-quality care and support throughout their recovery, rehabilitation, return to duty in the Canadian Armed Forces or transition to civilian life.

This is why the Canadian Armed Forces provides health services across Canada and overseas to Canadian military personnel through the Canadian Forces health services group.

Additionally, Canadian Armed Forces offers a wide range of supports to assist ill and injured members and their families throughout the recovery process, including the Return to Duty program, Soldier On, and the operational stress injury social support program.

Through these efforts, the Canadian Armed Forces will continue to assist its ill or injured members both at home and abroad.

With regard to part (a), the Canadian Armed Forces uses the disease and injury surveillance system to capture the visits of deployed personnel to a Canadian Armed Forces medical facility. The Canadian Armed Forces searched this database and found that 744 Canadian Armed Forces members were injured in Iraq between December 2015 and May 31, 2021.

With regard to part (b), the disease and injury surveillance system provides a categorization of an injury based on the mechanism of injury, such as a battle-related injury. The system does not capture the exact nature of each injury.

A battle-related injury is defined as any injury occurring as a direct consequence of a hostile action which may include direct and indirect fire, bombs, gas attacks, mines, etc. Most battle-related injuries are caused as a consequence of a hostile action, rather than the hostile action itself. For example, a soldier injured by descending stairs into a shelter in response to a rocket attack has suffered a battle-related injury, but was not injured by the rocket itself. These injuries may be mild and fully recoverable, such as a cut or soft tissue injury, or may be severe and permanent.

The Canadian Armed Forces searched the disease and injury surveillance system and found that of the 744 injuries in Iraq between December 2015 and May 31, 2021, 47 were categorized as battle-related.

With regard to parts (c) and (d), a detailed analysis of the nature and exact cause of injury would require a manual search of members' medical records.

Information contained in medical records cannot be released due to privacy concerns surrounding the potential to identify a member or disclose personal or health information about that member.

With regard to part (e), Canadian Armed Forces members who sustain wounds as a direct result of hostile action during operations in Iraq may be eligible for the Sacrifice Medal.

National Defence awarded two Sacrifice Medals to Canadian Armed Forces personnel as a result of injuries sustained while deployed on operations in Iraq between December 2015, and May 31, 2021.

The official description, eligibility criteria and history of the Sacrifice Medal is available online at www.canada.ca/en/department-national-defence/services/medals/medals-chart-index/sacrifice-medal-sm.html

With regard to part (f), information on the number of injured members in Iraq repatriated to Canada as a result of injury is not centrally tracked and would require a manual review of the medical, personnel and operational files related to the 744 medical injuries, which could not be completed in the allotted time.

* * *

[English]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, further-

Government Orders

more, if the government's response to Question No. 740 could be made an order for return, this return would be tabled immediately.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Text]

Question No. 740—**Mr. Paul Manly:**

With regard to the Department of National Defence (DND) firing ranges in Nanaimo and Chilliwack, British Columbia (BC): (a) did the use of the Nanaimo range change since the 2019 closure of the Vokes range in Chilliwack, BC, including (i) how many days per year the range is being used now versus before the closure of the Vokes range, (ii) any change in the caliber of weapons being used in the Nanaimo range; (b) did the DND assess the (i) sound intensity, including rapidity and decibel levels of the firing range at various distances over time, including before and after the closure of Vokes range, (ii) social and health impacts of the range on local residents within a 10-kilometre radius from the range, including residents with post-traumatic stress disorder and refugees from war zones, (iii) impact of the range on the surrounding environment and wildlife, (iv) feasibility of relocating the range to a less populated area, well outside of present and future residential neighbourhoods and potential developments; (c) did the DND complete its planned review of all of its assets in BC and, if not, when does it estimate it will be completed; and (d) did the DND conduct any of said assessments or reviews, and, if so, (i) what were the results, (ii) what actions have been taken as a result, (iii) will future actions be taken as a result and, if so, when?

(Return tabled)

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I ask that all remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed from June 7 consideration of the motion that Bill C-6, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (conversion therapy), be read the third time and passed.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Resuming debate, the hon. member for Peace River—Westlock has one and a half minutes remaining in the debate.

The hon. member.

Government Orders

Mr. Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Madam Speaker, as I resume my speech from over a week ago, I want to echo the concerns that many people have brought forward about Bill C-6 and its definition of conversion therapy. Canadians from across the country have expressed concern and asked parliamentarians to fix the definition as they are concerned about private conversations and freely chosen, voluntary counselling being criminalized.

Looking back at the committee that studied this bill, there were concerns expressed by several witnesses along these lines, with members of multiple parties endorsing that position as well. The member for the Bloc at the justice committee, the member for Rivière-du-Nord, expressed concerns about the impacts of the legislation. Along with the testimony from witnesses, many briefs were submitted to the committee. Almost 300 individuals and groups wrote briefs, which means that Canadians were interested in and concerned about this bill. The justice committee did not even take the necessary time to have the briefs translated or reviewed before it voted and adopted this bill. Why did the committee members not take the time to read over these briefs? Many Canadians are wondering.

Fixing the definition is what Canadians are asking for. The Liberal government has failed Canadians by coming up with a definition that does not have unanimous support in this place. Conservatives are opposed to conversion therapy and are looking forward to a bill that would ban conversion therapy and not conversations.

Ms. Lianne Rood (Lambton—Kent—Middlesex, CPC): Madam Speaker, I have received hundreds of emails and letters from constituents who are very concerned that their parental rights will be taken away from them, or their pastoral right to counsel their children or people who might be seeking their advice on this particular issue.

Can the member comment on this?

Mr. Arnold Viersen: Madam Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for her hard work in this place.

I agree with her. I have heard from Canadians from across the country who are concerned about the definition of conversion therapy, particularly around the word “practice”. The word “practice” is not clearly defined in Canadian law, so what is a practice that would be covered by this law? This law would be banning a treatment, service or practice, and that is fundamentally what folks are concerned about. What is the definition of a practice? Is it just a conversation that people are having? Is it a prayer that is being prayed for somebody? There are many things. “Religious practice” is a term that we use often in the religious world. Would a religious practice therefore be considered conversion therapy? That is what folks are concerned about.

• (1755)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Queen’s Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, many people following the debate see the Conservatives using the issue of a definition as a bit of a scapegoat to justify their behaviour on the legislation itself. The concerns have been addressed. Members

from all parties except the Conservative Party seem to recognize that.

Can the member clearly indicate what his personal position is on conversion therapy? Does he support it, or does he not? I ask that he stay away, as much as possible, from this whole definition, which many Canadians see as the Conservative Party members using an excuse to justify their vote.

Mr. Arnold Viersen: Madam Speaker, the Conservative Party has been extremely clear, and I have been as well, that we are opposed to conversion therapy. We are opposed to what people think of as conversion therapy.

“[P]ractice, treatment or service” is not a clearly defined definition of conversion therapy. Particularly, counselling that changes behaviour is a concerning part of the definition. A lot of counselling is attempting to change behaviour, and that is exactly what I have been hearing from folks around the country.

Over 300 briefs were written to the justice committee on this and they were ignored. The government members ignored those briefs. They did not listen to those briefs. They did not take the time to have them translated. They ran this bill through with a bad definition. Not only Conservatives on the committee said that, but Bloc members said it as well.

[Translation]

Ms. Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to hear my colleague say that we are opposed to requiring conversion therapy without the individual’s consent. That is exactly what Bill C-6 is about. I invite my colleague to watch *Boy Erased* to understand this important nuance. This is reassuring, and I think we will soon be ready to vote.

[English]

Mr. Arnold Viersen: Madam Speaker, we are trying to ban degrading and harmful practices when we say we want to ban conversion therapy. The bill would not do that. Therefore, I will be voting against it, as I did at second reading. We want a bill that bans conversion therapy, not this definition of it.

Many people asked for amendments to bring clarity to the bill. Once again, I will reference the over 300 briefs that the justice committee ignored when it rammed the bill through. These proposals included defining conversion therapy as a practice, treatment or service. We could put in greater precision and protections so that people can get the counselling they want, private conversations and discussions can happen and parents can set house rules for sexuality that happens in their own home.

Mr. Dane Lloyd (Sturgeon River—Parkland, CPC): Madam Speaker, today we are debating a very unfortunately worded piece of legislation, Bill C-6, an act to amend the Criminal Code regarding conversion therapy. I say it is unfortunate because this legislation fails to accurately define what conversion therapy is. It fails to provide clarity for Canadians, and I believe that it puts LGBTQ+ Canadians, children, parents, religious leaders and medical professionals at risk.

From the outset, I have been clear that I do not support conversion therapy, which involves coercive, involuntary and abusive practices that seek to change someone's sexual orientation. The evidence we have heard is clear: These practices have been harmful to those who have participated and they should not be allowed to continue.

The problem I have as a legislator is that the government has adopted a definition of conversion therapy that goes far beyond the scope of this harmful practice, and risks creating significant harms for families as a result. Going by the very definition the government has included in the legislation, we are asked to accept that even discouraging someone from “non-heterosexual attraction or sexual behaviour or non-cisgender gender expression” is a criminal act of conversion therapy.

The Minister of Justice has tried to assure members of the House that honest discussions about sexuality will not be criminalized under this act, but it is very apparent that the wording has been left so vague as to open up the very real possibility that the courts could interpret honest discussions about sexuality as potentially criminal. Without further clarification, we are introducing confusion into the Criminal Code, which could potentially lead to many honest Canadians being subject to a criminal investigation for honest discussions about sexuality.

The legislation is also potentially very harmful to children under the age of 16, who I believe are unable to truly consent to life-altering surgeries and drug regimens to achieve gender transition. This legislation could lead to the criminalization of important information streams that are essential for people to make informed decisions regarding gender transitions. In the recent United Kingdom High Court decision of *Bell v. Tavistock*, the court ruled that it is highly unlikely that children under 13 could truly consent to the use of puberty blockers. The court also analyzed the considerable effects of these treatments and concluded that it was even doubtful that children under the age of 16 could understand the long-term risks and consequences of these treatments.

This legislation potentially undermines the ability of medical professionals to share critical medical information that may lead to discouraging a child from undergoing a gender transition. The consequences for these children, as we have seen in the *Tavistock* case, are permanent and tragic. This puts LGBTQ+ youth at significant risk, as they may not be given access to the necessary medical information and frank advice needed for them to make informed decisions.

I am also very concerned over the effect this legislation could have on families, the foundational building blocks of a free society. The inclusion of gender expression and penalties for the repression of non-cisgender behaviour creates risks for families that could result in bad outcomes for children.

It is not hard to imagine a young boy who wants to go to school dressed in female clothes. Many parents would force their child to wear what they believe are gender-appropriate clothes, and I believe in the majority of those cases the parents are doing it out of a genuine care and concern for the well-being of their child. When that child goes to school, perhaps he will tell the teacher that he believes he is of another gender and that his parents refuse to let him

Government Orders

wear female clothing. If the practice of conversion therapy, as poorly defined by the government, is made a criminal offence, teachers would probably have little choice but to report the parents to children's services for allegations of emotional abuse. The ramifications of this outcome would be highly damaging to the welfare of children, families and society. The definition of conversion therapy must be clarified, and the rights of well-meaning parents who are caring for their children must be protected.

One result of this legislation is that it could lead to an infringement on the rights of LGBTQ+ Canadians to seek out services they may genuinely wish to access. In my exploration of this topic, I spoke with members of the LGBTQ+ community who, for religious or personal reasons, felt they did not want to engage in certain activities.

● (1800)

In some cases, members of these communities may have been struggling with issues of sex addiction or sexual practices that could lead to serious physical, emotional or spiritual consequences. Under this legislation, it would not necessarily be illegal to offer services that would be covered under the definition of “conversion therapy” to consenting adults. However, it would be very difficult for LGBTQ+ adults to find or access these services considering the effect of this legislation, which is essentially to make these services impossible to advertise and, by extension, to access in Canada.

This could even lead to cases of discrimination, whereby a heterosexual who is seeking counsel and support for dealing with sex addiction or harmful sexual behaviours will receive treatment, but an LGBTQ+ person would be turned away. I do not think the government intended to discriminate against LGBTQ Canadians, but I believe that it is a very real possibility under this legislation as it has been drafted. Again, this demonstrates why the flawed definition of “conversion therapy” is leading to confusion and significant potential adverse outcomes for LGBTQ Canadians.

Furthermore, the legislation's poor definition of “conversion therapy” could potentially lead to outcomes whereby well-meaning people with bonafide constitutionally protected beliefs will be made into criminals. When people are driven by a sincere desire to help those who come to them struggling with issues, they should not be treated as criminals for sharing their perspective. In the case of religious leaders who are approached by members of their congregation looking for guidance, I believe that under this legislation, the very act of even sharing passages of the Bible could be considered a criminal act of conversion therapy.

These provisions create the very real possibility of criminal sanctions against those who hold unpopular opinions in whole or in part because of those opinions. Punishing people for having unpopular opinions or beliefs is not a Canadian value. Given the religious views of conservative Muslims and Christians, among others, it is probable that those impacted by this legislation will be people who come from various faith backgrounds. This is potentially a case of enforcing religious discrimination.

Government Orders

Jail time is not an appropriate punishment for those who hold differing viewpoints, particularly religious views. The criminal penalties in this legislation, which include a maximum of between two and five years in prison, are on par with assault, abandonment of a child and infanticide. To treat people who hold constitutionally protected beliefs on par with those who kill children is completely disproportionate. I propose to the government that the provisions of this act are already addressed by human rights legislation and human rights tribunals. Given that we are debating competing rights, such as the equality rights of LGBTQ Canadians and the rights of freedom of expression and freedom of religion, it would be far better to delegate the adjudication of these difficult decisions to a body that is equipped to deal with them.

In cases where there is evidence of harm related to conversion therapy, such as forcible confinement, assault or kidnapping, the Criminal Code already has significant mechanisms to deal with these matters. In cases where there is a dispute between people over what is and what is not legitimate to say to somebody regarding their sexual orientation or gender identity and expression, it would be far better for the human rights tribunals to be investigating and making decisions on these matters rather than the criminal courts.

In closing, I have illustrated a number of reasons, including the poor definition, the potential for discrimination and the possibility that human rights tribunals could do a far better job of adjudicating these difficult decisions on competing rights, that I cannot support this legislation at this time. I believe that Bill C-6 would harm some LGBTQ Canadians, some families and society in general, which outweighs the potential benefits outlined in it. If the government is truly interested in working in good faith with concerned Canadians, it will commit to amending the definition in this legislation to provide clarity and protections for families, counsellors and medical professionals.

• (1805)

Mr. Derek Sloan (Hastings—Lennox and Addington, Ind.): Madam Speaker, the member mentioned the Keira Bell case in the United Kingdom. That is very important.

I want to ask the member about some of the guidance we heard from expert psychologists and psychiatrists at committee. They were concerned that this bill would foster an affirmation-only process that would put some kids on a one-track road to affirmation, which leads to chemical hormone-blocking treatments and maybe even surgery. If the member could expand on that, I would appreciate it.

Mr. Dane Lloyd: Madam Speaker, the Minister of Justice has been at pains to explain and to try to defend this legislation, saying that an exploration of sexual identity or sexual orientation would not be subject to criminal sanctions, but it seems to be very clear in the way that the legislation has been written and the intent behind it that there is no room for people to have confusion about their orientation or their gender. It is either black or white. However, we know there is a lot of gray in between.

I believe the definition needs to be very clear, because these are really complicated issues. To put criminal sanctions of two to five years on people, many of whom have a sincere desire to help peo-

ple who may be struggling, is vastly disproportionate and inappropriate.

• (1810)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Madam Speaker, I sense that, at this time, the Conservative Party is being influenced by its religious right wing and is looking for excuses.

The Conservatives say they are against conversion therapy, but they do not want to vote to ban it. Conversion therapy is an abomination that sometimes does lasting harm to those who undergo it.

Does my colleague agree that all forms of conversion therapy that do not result from private or family conversations are not healthy? The idea behind this type of therapy is that certain sexual orientations, gender identities or gender expressions are not healthy.

Is that not what is making the Conservative Party uneasy at this time?

[*English*]

Mr. Dane Lloyd: Madam Speaker, I reject the premise of the member's question.

If the government were to fix the definition to tackle the real problem that is conversion therapy, I would be more than happy to vote for this legislation. The fact that the government has not been willing to address those concerns that hundreds of constituents have written to me about and the views that thousands of people across Canada have expressed shows me that this is a cynical ploy by the Liberal government.

I have to say that I respect the NDP position on this issue, because I firmly believe it actually wants a ban on conversion therapy, unlike the Liberal government, which says it wants a ban on conversion therapy but then leaves the bill to linger on the Order Paper for months and months on end, only bringing it up at the last second.

It is a cynical power play by the Liberal government. This government is not actually interested in getting a ban on conversion therapy passed.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is certainly amazing that the member is advocating postponing the debate or discussion on this legislation.

The government is bringing forward a number of pieces of legislation that are of critical public interest, including the budget bill. The Conservatives are playing that destructive force of delay and prevention, trying to take a day off, not wanting to debate things, and then criticizing the government for not having a debate.

The bottom line is this: Can the member be straightforward and tell Canadians why Conservatives are using the excuse of the definition in order to justify their position? They cannot have it both ways. Conservatives cannot say they do not support the legislation and they do not support conversion therapy.

Government Orders

Mr. Dane Lloyd: Madam Speaker, the answer is simple: The definition is flawed. If the definition were not flawed, there would not be a problem here today. We proposed a very simple, straight-forward amendment to fix the definition, and the government has refused to work with us on it.

The fact is that the bill came out of committee in December and we were back at work in late January. The government could have put this up for debate at a number of opportunities, but it only really put it up for debate very close to the closing of the House. It leads me to believe that the government is not being sincere with this legislation and that it is not really, truly interested in getting it passed at all.

* * *

[*Translation*]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed Bill S-230, an act to amend the Citizenship Act, granting citizenship to certain Canadians, to which the concurrence of the House is desired.

* * *

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-6, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (conversion therapy), be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Damien Kurek (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is an honour to once again enter into debate in this place, and to do so on an important subject that should be a unifying force among all Canadians. Unfortunately, we have seen politics being played in a way that is inhibiting the ability to accomplish what is intended here.

Let me first clarify a couple of things on which I have heard some of my colleagues asking questions. It is unfortunate, because time and time again we Conservatives have made it very clear that we are opposed to conversion therapy, as have I. All Canadians deserve to be treated with dignity and respect, yet we have seen time and time again throughout this debate the politicization of a very important subject for partisan gain. I find it unfortunate that this has been the case with this dialogue, and in some cases we have seen the shutting down of dialogue.

I have heard from many constituents on this matter. I have heard from folks across Canada and on both sides of the issue. What I found very interesting is that the dialogue that has been offered by members of the House, and in some cases not just members of the Conservative Party but other parties as well, has been very constructive in ensuring that there is a legitimate, respectful discussion about something that has truly had a significant impact on people's lives and that needs to be addressed. However, we have seen some members try to dismiss some of the valid concerns that have been brought forward, which has taken away from what could have been a unifying discussion among all Canadians. I am troubled that this

has been a game played by the Liberal government time and time again.

My colleagues have articulated very well some of the concerns related to the definition of conversion therapy and some of the possible unintended consequences of legislation that is not specifically clear. In fact, I would point to members of the Liberal Party specifically; when the Minister of Justice was asked questions on the bill, he acknowledged that there were some challenges in the possible interpretations of the legislation before us.

However, I will go back a little further, because I think that the context for the discussion that we are having today is very important.

The bill was introduced prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, which we all know ended up basically seeing the legislative agenda of the government shut down for an extended period of time. After Parliament was prorogued, a whole bunch of bills had to be reintroduced. First, to the inevitable questions that will come from members of the government party who are somehow blaming Conservatives for being obstructionists, I would simply suggest that the 35-plus-day delay, the committee dysfunction that has resulted from the government covering up various aspects of investigations into its members' conduct and whatnot, has led to a significant delay.

However, what could have been an opportunity on a bill like this was not taken advantage of. Again, it was an opportunity to unify Canadians around an important discussion. The Liberals did not take advantage of that. When the government brought forward this legislation prior to the pandemic, some concerns were raised, and some of my colleagues raised those concerns. Interest across this country on both sides of the debate raised concerns on this subject. However, when the government reintroduced the bill in the fall, it did not take the opportunity to clarify some of these aspects of the bill. That, I would suggest, would have been a much more straight-forward process to allow Canadians to be unified in opposition to something that all Canadians are opposed to, which is conversion therapy. The fact is that the Liberals did not take advantage of the opportunity to provide leadership and carefully consider some of the issues that had been brought to their attention.

● (1815)

The result is that close to a year and a half later, we are seeing this debated, and some of the accusations that are being made by members opposite are certainly very troubling and call into question the integrity of certain members of this House. That is unfortunate. We need to be able to have dialogue and discussion and ensure that we are all working in the best interests of our constituents.

Government Orders

I have heard from constituents on this matter, including before the current Bill C-6 debate. I have heard members of the Liberal Party talk about how nobody shares the views that I and a number of other Conservatives have articulated when it comes to concerns, and that is simply not true. The fact is that there are those who have raised concerns. The member for Sturgeon River—Parkland who spoke previously talked about some of the challenges in relation to the committee work that was done. The committee had a significant number of briefs that were submitted but not considered. It is our job as parliamentarians and legislators to ensure that we take great care in things as simple as the wording of a definition, and also the bigger picture, the possible implications of legislation and the possible impact that this legislation could have on, for example, people of faith and various folks within the LGBT community. Unfortunately, we saw that those concerns were dismissed, and when there was an opportunity within committee to have a wholesome discussion, we saw politics being played instead. I find that very unfortunate.

Further, we could have seen the definition fixed and some clarity added to this particular piece of legislation. I would suggest that if this were the only piece of legislation in which this sort of issue was brought forward, then it might be a fair criticism, but the reality is that it is not. Time and time again we see legislation brought forward by the current government that seems to be intentionally divisive. That is not leadership. It is unfortunate that in a debate as significant as this one, we are seeing politics being played.

I have no doubt that there will be those who are ready to attack members of the Conservative Party who may vote against this bill. To those, I would share a couple of brief comments.

I mentioned earlier that I have heard from many constituents on this matter, including before the issue was initially voted on, and I took great care on both sides of the issue to speak to a number of those individuals. There were countless phone calls, emails and messages back and forth regarding this subject, and in the respectful dialogue that ensued, I saw something incredible happen, something that is unique to democratic discourse, and that was the idea of respect.

The fact is that not everybody who reached out agreed with the position the government has or the position that I had in terms of the opposition to this bill at second reading, but after discussion, dialogue and respectful discourse, there was a level of unity that I found very encouraging, and it is unfortunate that this has not always translated into this discussion that we now have on the floor, whether physically or virtually, in this House of Commons.

It is that sort of division that is causing a breakdown and a lack of trust in the work that needs to be accomplished by all of us as parliamentarians. In my case, I had hundreds of people, the vast majority of whom encouraged me to maintain my position on this matter and to share my concerns respectfully about the need to have clarity in this legislation. For members of the government to somehow suggest that this is an ideological escapade would be misleading at best and outright dishonest at worst, and I think it is a troubling trend we see within our democratic discourse.

Let me finish by saying this: It is important for us to have respectful dialogue in this place, and as someone who can be very

partisan, I will say that we need to ensure that good governance, good legislation, respectful dialogue, and respect for Canadians and the rule of law are at the very forefront of all we do.

• (1820)

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Madam Speaker, during my presentation, I presented the personal and emotional testimonies of those who found that gender transition was not a permanent solution to their gender dysphoria and who found worth in their own process of detransition. These individuals have made their stories public, about detransitioning or deciding not to make transitions surgically or with the use of hormones. They stress that they are in no way wanting to be disrespectful toward other people's personal choices. As it stands, Bill C-6 would criminalize people like them.

As it is currently written, could the member speak to how this will restrict the free, respectful and exploratory speech of those with valuable lived experiences?

• (1825)

Mr. Damien Kurek: Madam Speaker, the member brings up a very good point that we saw represented in much of the evidence that was presented to committee. The suggestion that somehow there is universal acceptance of Bill C-6 as a need to move forward to address these issues is simply incorrect.

There are many lived stories from Canadians from coast to coast who have demonstrated that it is not as clear cut as is being suggested and that the implications of this bill could be very severe and would actually take away the rights of Canadians who are living their lives. It is very troubling that could be one of the significant implications of a bill being passed that has not had the proper consideration and due debate around some of the very valid concerns that have been brought forward.

Ms. Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Madam Speaker, my question to the member for Battle River—Crowfoot is about a video that he posted on his Facebook page on May 21, 2020 taken from the website “fixthedefinition.ca”. This video promotes petitions opposing the ban on conversion therapy proposed in Bill C-6 and features a prominent social Conservative activist repeating disinformation about the provisions of Bill C-6. This video purports to give voice to those in the LGBTQ community opposed to the bill, but if people watch to the end, they can see the notice “produced by the offices of” the member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan and the member for Cloverdale—Langley City.

First, was the member aware that this piece of disinformation and propaganda was produced by two of his colleagues? Second, does his reposting of the video mean that he thinks producing such a video is a proper use of House of Commons funds?

Government Orders

Mr. Damien Kurek: Madam Speaker, I do find it interesting that the member would be quoting from an article from a supposed “news site”. I say that with air quotes because it is funded by a wing of the NDP. It is this sort of divisiveness that is taking away from the very real concerns that have been brought forward about Bill C-6. For this member to hedge a premise of a question in a way that somehow alleges that there is nefarious intent behind the very real concerns that myself and other members of my party have brought forward regarding Bill C-6, is exactly why, and I wish the member would have listened more carefully to my speech. The need for respectful dialogue is paramount in this place so that we can all do our jobs as legislators to ensure that we are serving Canadians in the best way possible. Certainly, I endeavour to do that each and every day and I would encourage the member opposite to do so also.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the member says “respectful dialogue”, but I thought the member for the NDP’s intervention was extremely respectful. She asked a very simple, straightforward question and the member chose not to answer it.

I would like to give the member an opportunity to answer her question about that video that was produced.

Mr. Damien Kurek: Madam Speaker, my question to that member would be very simple: Has he had the opportunity to read some of the evidence that was submitted to the committee when Bill C-6 was studied? If so, he would see very clearly that there is a wide variety of perspectives on this matter that demonstrate that it is not as clear cut as the divisive nature that certain individuals in this House are trying to make it out to be.

I would say, with great respect to many members of this House who have encouraged that effective dialogue, it is unfortunate that there are some who would stoop to such a low level that they would discourage what would ultimately result in better outcomes for Canadians.

• (1830)

Mr. Derek Sloan (Hastings—Lennox and Addington, Ind.): Madam Speaker, it is a privilege to rise on this issue. I understand that the opinions to counter this bill are not as numerous as the opinions in favour of it, but they are nonetheless no less important.

When I was watching the debate ensue at committee, I was not a part of the committee, but as an interested parliamentarian, I watched all of it. The debate with respect to witnesses and so forth was rather even-handed. I did not count the number of witnesses who raised concerns, versus those who were in favour of it, but there were plenty of professionals and other individual people who brought up real situations which would be technically against the letter of the law according to this, but I think we would all agree are legitimate concerns. I just want to, as best as I can, address those today. Ten minutes is not sufficient for that, but I will do my very best. Of course, time is lacking to do much of what we need to do in this House.

I am in support of a ban on harmful counselling. There are many other jurisdictions, governments and cities around the world that have banned conversion therapy, but in a different way. They have different definitions that are far less broad. Of course, many of

them, if not all, outside of a few, are not criminal in nature. I think it is problematic when we have a very broad definition that is also criminal because we want to ban harmful courses of practice, but we do not want to put people in jail who, frankly, do not deserve to be there.

As others have raised before, we want to be entirely certain that what we are targeting is, in fact, the evil that we are looking to target and not be overbroad in that ban. I am a little bit concerned that the assumptions that underpin this bill are faulty. When not all, but some of the assumptions are faulty we can be led astray. I just want to take issue with some of them.

The first is the myth that Bill C-6’s definition of conversion therapy accurately identifies treatments that will be harmful and does so in a way that is not overbroad. I think, of course, that there are abusive practices out there and I think that we should aim to ban them, but what Bill C-6 has done here is to basically, in my view, when looking at the definition, outlaw any validated form of talk therapy for Canadians wishing to deal with various issues related to sexual attraction and gender identity. For those who would like to look into the proceedings of the committee, there are many examples of very credible witnesses who have gone through circumstances where they needed counselling to address certain things and their stories are credible. I do not have time to go through them all, but members can look at them.

I also want to say that with respect to transgender identification, particularly in children, there is a conversation going on globally right now that we are missing in this debate on Bill C-6.

In the U.K., the Government Equalities Office for example, is looking into whether the influence of social media and the discussion of gender identity with young people have contributed to the striking increase in referrals. When I get into some of the data here on the striking increase, I think we could all agree that there is something here that needs to be looked at. In the last 10 years, in the United Kingdom, which mirrors data from other countries, we have seen referrals to these gender clinics skyrocket. We have seen them increase by about 1,000% for boys and 4,400% for biological females.

These exponential rises, as I have said, are increasing in other western nations as well. We heard one of the members earlier speak about the United Kingdom High Court ruling with respect to Keira Bell. Keira Bell is one of the young women who was referred to the Tavistock institute, which is the clinic there that deals with gender referrals for gender identity. She was told that, if she went through the process, she would feel better about herself, so she went on to hormone blockers. She had a double mastectomy. She spent several years living, outwardly looking like a man, and she came to regret it. She was in her early twenties. She took the Tavistock institute to court saying she was not in a position where she could consent to this treatment, but was basically told that this would be the answer she needed to her life. It did not make anything better and, in fact, it made a lot of things worse.

Government Orders

• (1835)

The court ruled that people under 16 could likely not consent to puberty-blocking treatments. This bill does the opposite. This bill says that if someone wants to put their child on hormone blockers or if they want to basically put them on the road to surgery, that is totally fine, but to give them the wrong type of counselling could get them in trouble.

Some people would say that there is a clause in the bill that allows people to explore. However, the fact is we heard from very competent professionals in committee that this clause would not be enough, when there is potentially a five-year jail term hanging over people's head.

We heard from Ken Zucker, an internationally renowned expert in gender identity. He was basically working with our clinic here, CAMH, for decades. He is internationally renowned in this field. He has literally written the book on how to treat gender identity in children. He was accused of conversion therapy a few years ago. He was fired from his position, summarily. He had the wherewithal and the resources to take his employer to court. He won a substantial settlement. He cleared his name.

This is the type of thing that we are seeing, before Bill C-6. If this is the sort of witch hunt environment we are seeing before Bill C-6, it is going to increase significantly with Bill C-6.

Other than the U.K., we are seeing other countries in Europe, Sweden and Finland, have gone even a step further. They are moving away from what is called affirmation-only models of care, which I suggest is what Bill C-6 is, this is what other professionals in committee said about this bill. In Sweden and Finland, they are saying there must be a sober second look when a child identifies as transgender. A sober second look is the very thing that I believe Bill would criminalize.

Bill C-6 would criminalize parents who want to discourage their young child from transitioning, who would not be making life-altering decisions. I do not believe it is hateful for a parent to make a decision based on accurate medical facts.

When it comes to transgender identification in children, reliable data indicates the vast majority of kids who identify as another gender would grow out of it, meaning by the time they become an adult, many of them, up to 80% according to some studies, will identify or accept the body they were born with. I think that given data like that, we really need to give a lot of room here for kids to explore but not to push them on this one-track mode of puberty blockers and eventually surgery. This is what is being criticized by people like Keira Bell.

I read an article in the National Post a year or so ago by Barbara Kay that highlighted the story of a young girl, JB is the acronym used, a child who is currently involved in an application in the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal. This involves a teacher in an Ottawa area school who told this six year-old that girls do not exist. This six-year-old was a happy, loving young girl. I have a seven-year-old, a six-year-old and a five-year-old. The seven- and five-year-olds are girls.

This six-year-old became distraught, withdrawn and depressed. She did not understand what it meant. The parents asked the teacher if she could just cool it on some of these ethereal gender theory comments. The teacher and administration refused to do this, and the parents had to take that girl out of that school. They moved her to a different school, and have taken this particular school board to court.

The girl is once again a happy, well-adjusted young girl. It just goes to show that we have to be careful what we are putting into the minds of our young children. What the U.K. high court case found is that once these kids are put onto these drugs, the hormone blockers, it pretty much puts them on the road to surgery. It is kind of like a one-track street.

We need to be very careful. We need to have a sober second look in this country.

There are in fact many people, even in LGB communities, who are against this bill. I will read an email I received. It said:

Dear Mr. Derek Sloan,

As a Lesbian, I am asking you to investigate the use of gender identity in bill C-6. Approximately 75% of trans identifying youth will grow up to be gay or lesbian, if not affirmed and medically transitioned. This bill, as written, ensures that these gay and lesbian youth will be medically transitioned into straight adults.

She goes on to say:

Please protect vulnerable gay and lesbian youth from being told that they are "born in the wrong body" and told they should transition to feel "right" and to "fit in". Sincerely...

• (1840)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Unfortunately, the hon. member's time is up. I am sure that during questions and comments, he will have a chance to respond.

Questions and comments. The hon. member for Peace River—Westlock.

Mr. Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Madam Speaker, one of the things that was notable in the committee was the 300 briefs that were just ignored. I was wondering if the member has any comments about that.

Mr. Derek Sloan: Madam Speaker, I noted that as well. I also noted some members of the other parties, I believe a member from the Bloc Québécois, also said that we should spend a little time on them, even just out of respect for the people who submitted these briefs.

The member is right, and I think there were about 300 or so that came in. They came in at the last minute and there was not enough time to have them translated, so the committee finished its work on this bill without even looking at those briefs. That is problematic. It shows there was a lot of interest in this bill, and we owe it to Canadians to have spent the time to look at it.

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Madam Speaker, this is interesting to hear because the personal and emotional testimonies I shared in my speech were all of young people who had transitioned in their teens and then realized in their early twenties that gender transition was not a permanent solution to their gender dysphoria, and they were in their own process of detransition.

Clearly there is a concern here, as has been mentioned. I am wondering if he would expand further on how Bill C-6, as currently written, could very well restrict the freedom of the respectful and exploratory speech of these individuals with valuable lived experience.

Mr. Derek Sloan: Madam Speaker, one thing that struck me about the debate on this bill, and of course this was not reflected in committee, although I think in committee there was a balanced discussion on many of the issues, was that right now there is a conversation going on around the world with respect to transgender identification in children. I heard some members talk about the fact that a small percentage of the people who transition have regrets.

We are on the tipping point of a big iceberg of regret, because back 10 years or 20 years ago, the funnel for who experienced surgery with respect to transgender changes was a lot narrower. We are seeing, as I said earlier, this meteoric rise in identification. We are seeing an increase of 1,000% for men and 4,400% for young girls. We are seeing a U.K. government office do research into why we are seeing this, so I think the tip of the iceberg of regret is just on the horizon.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, this member is in a neighbouring riding of mine. Certainly he has heard of the experiences at the Third Day Worship Centre in Kingston and what the experiences were of a number of members in that congregation. He will also probably know that the City of Kingston passed a bylaw banning conversion therapy. It is enforceable by a fine and is not a criminal offence because, obviously, it cannot do that, but it is taking measures.

He talked about what other jurisdictions were doing. Does he agree that was the right thing for the City of Kingston council to do?

Mr. Derek Sloan: Madam Speaker, that question brings up the issue of what exactly our definition covers. With respect to that particular situation, I have personally spoken to the man who underwent what happened in Kingston. I am not aware of the other cases, but I am talking about the main person who was testifying at city council.

With his particular situation, he was basically prayed over in a very public manner and advised to take a three-day fast. These are things none of us would maybe agree to or advise, but when we take a look at what happened to this person, do we believe the religious leaders of this church should go to jail for five years? They prayed over an 18-year-old who was requesting prayer at the time. Now, apparently they embarrassed him, and of course I do not agree with that, but is it worth a five-year jail sentence?

These are the questions we need to answer. When I was speaking to the minister earlier in this session, I said that the Canadian Psy-

chological Association has prayer in its definition and asked if this would ban prayer. I was told it would not.

• (1845)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The question is on the motion.

[*Translation*]

If a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes to request a recorded division or that the motion be adopted on division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands.

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, I would request a recorded division.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Pursuant to order made on Monday, January 25, the recorded division stands deferred until Tuesday, June 22 at the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions.

* * *

[*English*]

BROADCASTING ACT

MOTION THAT DEBATE BE NOT FURTHER ADJOURNED

Hon. Mona Fortier (Minister of Middle Class Prosperity and Associate Minister of Finance, Lib.): Madam Speaker, in relation to the consideration of Government Business No. 10, I move, seconded by the Minister of Canadian Heritage:

That the debate be not further adjourned.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Pursuant to Standing Order 67.1, there will now be a 30-minute question period.

The hon. House leader of the official opposition.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Madam Speaker, here we are again to talk about the infamous Bill C-10. We know that this bill has a direct impact on freedom of speech.

We were surprised to see that the bill originally contained a fundamental provision, clause 4.1, which clearly defined the terms of freedom of speech and clearly indicated that this bill would not affect those working on social media when it came time to produce and post music or cultural activities.

S. O. 57

Unfortunately, the government withdrew that amendment. Members will recall that the second opposition party asked for that clause to be reinstated three times. When we proposed that amendment, the government and the second opposition party opposed it.

How can the government introduce a bill that does not protect freedom of expression as it should, particularly since that protection used to be set out in the bill in black and white?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his comments. I would like to remind him of certain facts.

First, several members of his political party asked us to go even further with Bill C-10. We heard the same thing from an impressive number of stakeholders from across Canada, who told us that now that a company like YouTube has become the biggest distributor of music in Canada, it has to be included in Bill C-10. We did that.

The Department of Justice's highly independent and competent officials testified before the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage. They carried out an analysis that demonstrated there are no issues with freedom of expression and Bill C-10. In the bill, there are elements that provide for freedom of expression, freedom of creation and freedom of the press. My colleague opposite is also very aware of that.

Furthermore, the CRTC is not above Canadian law. The CRTC must also comply with Canada's many laws, including the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

• (1850)

Mr. Alain Therrien (La Prairie, BQ): Madam Speaker, time allocation is rarely acceptable. The Bloc Québécois defends the interests of Quebecers. We have been saying so since we first got here, and we have never deviated from that guiding principle.

Bill C-10 has unanimous support in Quebec. Quebecers agree. Quebec's artistic and cultural community, the very essence of our own identity, is waiting. It has supported the bill for a long time now. The Bloc Québécois will support this time allocation motion to make web giants pay their fair share to our creators, who have often been taken advantage of by these giants.

I would like to ask the minister a very simple question: Do you think waiting is costly for our Quebec creators?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I would like to remind the hon. member to address his remarks to the Chair, not directly to the minister.

The hon. minister.

Hon. Steven Guilbeault: Madam Speaker, through you, I want to thank my hon. colleague across the aisle for his question and for his party's support for Bill C-10.

He is quite right. This bill has the unanimous support of the Quebec National Assembly and the vast majority of artists. In fact, several thousand artists and organizations representing hundreds of thousands of artists in Quebec, of course, but also across the country, signed a petition in support of Bill C-10.

My colleague is right about the wait. Every month that goes by deprives artists of \$70 million. Some say that even if Bill C-10

were to pass, it would not come into force immediately. I agree, but every month that the implementation of Bill C-10 is delayed means \$70 million less for our artists and arts organizations.

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am rather shocked to see just how poorly the Liberals have managed this file. Based on the Yale report, we all agree that the web giants need to be included in the ecosystem. There is no issue there. That is not what is being debated.

The Liberal government imposed a gag order on a committee. That has happened just three times in 150 years. The gag order was for five hours, not even 10. They managed to impose it, which is very rare, but it was not enough. They still managed to drop the ball when they extended the proceedings to pass certain amendments, which were ultimately rejected by a ruling of the Speaker of the House.

Today, the Liberals moved a supermotion. Our issue is not with the substance of this bill, which is to protect culture and artists.

How are the Liberals incapable of passing a bill like this, even after imposing a gag order in committee? It is unbelievable.

Hon. Steven Guilbeault: Madam Speaker, what I find shocking and what the artistic community cannot understand is that the NDP refuses to support Bill C-10 and that it has sided with the Conservative Party.

I do not think anyone is surprised to see the Conservative Party do this, but I must admit that it is a surprise and a major disappointment to see the NDP follow suit.

[*English*]

Mr. Paul Manly (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, GP): Madam Speaker, the bill has been flawed from the beginning, and we have worked pretty hard at committee to try to fix it with over 120 amendments. The discussion around freedom of expression and whether the small online undertakings are responsible for the content that is uploaded comes down to a question of what is already in the Broadcasting Act. The act, which is from 1991, says, "This Act shall be construed and applied in a manner that is consistent with the freedom of expression and journalistic, creative and programming independence enjoyed by broadcasting undertakings."

Does that include the content that is uploaded by users of social media platforms? Has the minister looked into this to see that the constitutionality of the bill would stand up, or are we going to see challenges to the bill under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms for freedom of expression?

• (1855)

Hon. Steven Guilbeault: Madam Speaker, the hon. member and I have had numerous exchanges about Bill C-10, and I know he is very passionate about this. Again, I would remind the hon. member that the very credible, very competent and very independent civil servants of the Ministry of Justice have looked into this issue and provided analysis and testimonies to accompany them to the heritage committee, and that confirmed that there is no issue regarding Bill C-10 and freedom of expression or freedom of creation.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I think of some of the stuff we have heard, particularly from the Conservative opposition. I believe it was the member for Lethbridge who stated that the modernization of the Broadcasting Act was about supporting a niche lobby group and supporting artists or creators who cannot sell. I think the quote was about creating things that Canadians did not want to watch.

Perhaps it might be helpful if you would explain for us why are we doing this? Who is this supporting, and are they not the kinds of creations that Canadians do in fact want to watch and enjoy, and that create jobs right across our country?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I remind the hon. parliamentary secretary that she is to address all questions and comments through the Chair.

The hon. Minister of Canadian Heritage.

Hon. Steven Guilbeault: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my hon. colleague for her advocacy for artists and cultural organizations across the country.

It is important to remember that as more and more people transit from watching or listening to their music in more traditional ways to online streaming platforms, the revenues of Canadian traditional broadcasters are going down. As a society, we count on these revenues to fund our artists and our cultural sector for productions like *Kim's Convenience*, which has been a worldwide hit. In fact, it was one of the most-watched shows for a while in South Korea. We could be talking about *Schitt's Creek*, or *Corner Gas* or *District 31*. All these productions have received government support through the Broadcasting Act.

What we are doing right now is ensuring our legislation and regulations are adapted to the realities of the 21st century, and ensuring web giants pay their fair share. Why the Conservatives, and it seems sometimes the NDP, would be opposed to that is a bit beyond me.

[Translation]

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Madam Speaker, ever since the minister introduced Bill C-10 in November, everyone has been trying to improve it, despite its flaws. It did not address copyrights or CBC/Radio-Canada's mandate, and it was missing a lot of things to protect Canadian businesses and domestic French-language and Canadian productions.

Everyone tried to compromise to find a solution and improve the bill up until one Friday afternoon when the minister withdrew clause 4.1, which was supposed to be added to the Broadcasting Act, going after the content of social media users.

S. O. 57

My question for the minister and the Liberals is quite simple. Despite the gag order that the government imposed on us in committee and the fact that the Chair called the government to order by ruling many amendments out of order at committee stage—amendments that we will be voting on this evening—will the government agree to vote in favour of reinserting clause 4.1 into the legislation to protect the content of social media users, whatever it might be?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault: Madam Speaker, for starters, I have to refute the premise of my hon. colleague's question.

He says that everyone worked in good faith, but I just want to remind him that, well before Bill C-10 was even introduced, the former leader of the official opposition told the House that, had it been up to him, he would have tossed the Yale report, which had just been tabled, right in the trash. Furthermore, as soon as Bill C-10 was introduced, the Conservative Party objected to it, said the bill was bad and should be scrapped, and told us to start over.

In my opinion, there is no truth to the claim that everyone worked in good faith to move Bill C-10 forward.

• (1900)

[English]

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it seems that the minister may be quite confused. He keeps saying that he does not quite understand the NDP position in not voting with his government to push this through Parliament. The New Democrats have been clear. We are very supportive of getting help to our artists and we are supportive of Bill C-10. However, perhaps what the minister does not understand is the role Parliament plays in our parliamentary system, similar to the way the minister did not seem to really understand how broadcasting worked or, in fact, how his own bill worked before he tabled it.

We can be supportive of legislation and also find it very problematic to watch the way the minister has managed this file and is now trying to shove it through Parliament without giving parliamentarians time to get this bill right. I have offered time and again to work through the summer, to do whatever we need to do to get this bill through, and the minister just keeps asking why we will not support the Liberal time allocation. How is that respecting Parliament?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault: Mr. Speaker, there are two things I would like to answer for the hon. colleague. The first is that I was with the leader of the Bloc Québécois and the leader of the NDP on *Tout le monde en parle*, during which all three of us committed to work together to ensure Bill C-10 would be adopted. Right after that, the NDP changed its mind, after committing in front of millions of Quebecers and Canadians that the NDP would work with us to ensure that Bill C-10 would be adopted. Was that a lie to the Canadian public and to the viewers of this show, I do not know.

Ms. Heather McPherson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am wondering if the member actually accused the NDP of lying. We are not supposed to do in the House. I wonder if he wants to take that back.

S. O. 57

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order, I believe the minister questioned if something that was said could have been a lie. He did not specifically call anybody a liar. He was trying to understand. It seems to me as though he was trying to personally rationalize the situation.

The Deputy Speaker: I thank hon. members for their interventions. I did not hear the minister's words in this case as I was taken aside for a moment on an administrative matter. For general purposes, references to lying is always a tricky area. Generally, if it is not applied to an individual member, group and so on, although it is not advisable, it is not an unparliamentary reference.

The hon. minister can finish his response.

Hon. Steven Guilbeault: Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of artists support Bill C-10 and want it to be adopted. In fact, thousands of artists have signed a petition in favour of the bill. What the NDP is telling them and the chamber is that the NDP knows best, that artists do not know or understand. We have chosen to listen to artists, not the other way around.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us be clear what is going on with the New Democrats. They are lucky that the Bloc Québécois blinked first. That is the reality of the situation. They are trying to play both sides of this. They will not vote for the closure, but, of course, when we get to the vote on the bill itself, they will vote in favour of it because they know it would be political suicide to do otherwise. That is the reality of the situation.

We have now had this issue go before committee numerous times. It has been in the House. It has been in the public forum. Would the minister not agree that closure is necessary because of the antics put forward by the Conservative Party, in particular? Quite frankly, now is the time for members to put their stake in the sand and decide which side of the line they are on. Are they on the side of artists or on the side of big tech?

• (1905)

Hon. Steven Guilbeault: Mr. Speaker, frankly, I could not have said it better. Members stand with artists or with big tech, some of the largest and wealthiest companies on this planet. We have decided that we are on the side of artists. Clearly the Conservatives have decided they are on the side of big tech. As for the New Democrats, I do not know and I am not sure they know themselves.

Mr. Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, one of the things I am quite concerned about, and it is unprecedented, as we have never seen this before, is around the secret amendments at committee. The minister went on and on about how Conservatives spoke favourably about the bill when it was originally introduced and quoted us before the bill went to committee. However, amendments happened at committee. I saw on Twitter that Mr. Geist talked about secret amendments. This has been unprecedented.

Would the minister not agree with me that the bill has been fraught with issues from the get-go, particularly in committee, and the secret amendments that the Speaker had to rule on have been unprecedented in my time here and definitely not the epitome of being well managed?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault: Mr. Speaker, first, the Conservative Party's position was that the bill did not go far enough, that we needed to do more and include, according to some of the member's colleagues, companies like YouTube. Then it decided to move the needle and said that it was about freedom of speech. Then when the justice department said that there was no issue with freedom of speech, the Conservatives moved the needle again and said that it was about net neutrality. When it was explained what net neutrality was and the fact that Bill C-10 had nothing to do with net neutrality, they moved the dial again and said that it was these secret amendments.

Every time we have spoken about the bill, the Conservatives have been against it. They have clearly decided that they are siding with Google, Facebook and some of the wealthiest companies in the world. We have seen the contempt, which are not my words but the words of many artists, that the Conservative Party has shown to artists and our cultural sector.

Mr. Kerry Diotte (Edmonton Griesbach, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what is interesting is that in the minister's reality, this is all about artists, but to the real world, the non-Liberal world perhaps, to everybody I talk to about Bill C-10, it is about censorship, it is about what people can post on the Internet. It is the fear of government interference. We have seen big tech already clamping down on free speech. People are terrified of what Bill C-10 will bring.

I was giving a talk to a grade six class, and those children are worried about it. It seems like the whole world knows that this is all about censorship, but the minister thinks it is all about artists. We love artists, but this has nothing really to do about artists. The fear is censorship.

What would the minister say to these grade six children who are worried about their free speech because of the bill?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault: Mr. Speaker, the member said, "we love artists", which is interesting. When the Conservatives were in government, all they did was cut back on programs for artists, including, but not solely, the CBC. I would remind the member that the CBC is one of the largest broadcasters and supporters of artistic creation in the country.

However, every time we have brought forward proposals to help and support artists, the Conservatives have opposed it. I am having a really hard time reconciling the affirmation that they "love artists" with their actions. One could argue that actions actually speak louder than words.

Mr. Tim Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I sit on the heritage committee, and for months I watched our Conservative colleagues side with these Internet giants and against our Canadian artists, many times bringing up that misleading narrative about censorship or concerns of free speech. Artists are fierce defenders of free speech.

S. O. 57

Could the minister explain how modernizing the Broadcasting Act will help level the playing field for our Canadian artists and support them, while also ensuring that Canadians who use social media platforms are not subject to regulation?

• (1910)

Hon. Steven Guilbeault: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my hon. colleague for his advocacy as a member of the heritage committee and also as an artist himself for many years.

The member is absolutely right. There is this idea that the only people concerned with free speech in the country are the Conservatives. Artists have for decades, if not centuries, defended freedom of speech. The idea that they would all of a sudden forget about this just because they are in favour of Bill C-10 makes absolutely no sense. There are a number of safeguards in Bill C-10, and we have heard from Department of Justice, as well as in the body of the laws and regulations we have in Canada. The CRTC is not above the law.

Bill C-10 would not apply to individuals, and it says that very clearly in the bill right now.

Mr. Paul Manly (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, GP): Mr. Speaker, I have heard a lot from the minister about protecting artists and ensuring they are taken care of when they are up against the big giants.

I put forward a couple of amendments, one that was debated and one that was not debated because of the time allocation. They called for the establishment of a framework for the contractual practices between independent producers who produce a lot of stuff for the broadcast industry and the online program undertakings of the big companies. This was identified in the Yale Report, that there is a huge power imbalance between these small contractors and producers and the big companies. They have a system like this in the U.K. and in France, and it works very well.

The Coalition for the Diversity of Cultural Expressions has called for this as have the Alliance des producteurs francophones du Canada and the Canadian Media Producers Association. If the government is interested in defending independent producers and small production companies, how come it did not support my amendments?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault: Mr. Speaker, I would simply remind my hon. colleague that the organizations he mentioned, on top of the independent producers, have all come out in support of Bill C-10 and are all calling for its rapid adoption.

Bill C-10 will not solve everything. There are other issues we have to address when it comes to broadcasting and creation, and we will. However, Bill C-10 is a first step in that direction. It is not everything under the sun, but it is a first and very important step in the right direction.

Mr. Damien Kurek (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is good to be able to ask the minister a couple of very important questions. First, I would ask him to correct the record because it has been made very clear that not all artists support Bill C-10. In fact, I have heard from many, and I know that other colleagues have, including those who have reached out to the minister

directly, that they do not support Bill C-10, so that is misleading and incorrect rhetoric that he is speaking to.

Further, I would suggest that the minister should be careful how he references things because we saw time and again how he might say one thing on Sunday afternoon television and then his office would have to clarify and correct the record the next day. He would say one thing in question period and another thing at committee. I am curious which minister is actually speaking to us today, because there seems to be a lot of confusion from his office or from himself regarding Bill C-10.

There is one question I would really like to get an answer to. He talked about the example of *Kim's Convenience* being an epitome for Canadian success, whereas a recent report suggested that anti-Asian stereotypes were perpetrated through the production and what was in part government funding of that sitcom on Canadian television.

Does the minister support that sort of stereotypes being a part of Canadian culture and in his approach to legislating culture in this country?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault: Mr. Speaker, many would recognize that our government has done more for inclusion and diversity than any other governments before us. I would be the first one to recognize that we have a long way to go and we have so much more to do, but at least we are doing it.

• (1915)

Mr. Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I asked the minister a question again in the House on the topic of Bill C-10, unfortunately not dealing with the subject of Bill C-10, but dealing with the issue of ramming it through the House.

Recently, we saw the government guilty of trying to ram through a bunch of amendments, much to the surprise of many of us here who respect the process, respect committee work and yet again, we see the government time after time simply trying to sidestep the parliamentary process. We saw that example today again in the House, where the health officer who was supposed to produce documents as requested by the House still refused to do it, on the advice of the government.

With such an important bill as Bill C-10, why does the minister feel he needs to ram it through the House?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault: Mr. Speaker, the committee has had months and months to study Bill C-10 and in fact, before the Conservative Party started filibustering the work of the committee, things were going pretty well, but at one point the Conservatives decided that they would prefer to side with Google and Facebook instead of supporting Canadian artists, and then it was impossible to move the bill along. We could have had six more months of committee work and we would not have been able to get through Bill C-10 at the committee.

As I reminded members earlier, every month that passes deprives our artists and cultural sector of \$70 million that is kept in the pockets of some of the wealthiest and most powerful companies in the world.

S. O. 57

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we have legislation that was brought forward in November. We know the government chooses which legislation to bring onto the floor. That is well within its purview. There are now two days left until the House rises for the summer, potentially for this Parliament. Why are we voting on amendments that could have been dealt with much sooner and much more effectively if the government had brought the bill to the House sooner? The Liberals have been in power for six years. Why are we doing this with two days left, pushing it through, voting on amendments in the middle of the night?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault: Mr. Speaker, I am baffled by the question from the member. She refuses to support us and help us move Bill C-10 along, but when we do, she says, oh my goodness, why are we waiting until the last minute? We have been trying for many, many weeks to move the bill along, and if the NDP had helped us, maybe we would not be in this situation to start with.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: It is my duty to interrupt the proceedings at this time and put forthwith the question on the motion now before the House.

The question is on the motion.

[*English*]

If a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes to request a recorded division or that the motion be adopted on division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I request that it be adopted on division.

Some hon. members: We request a recorded division.

The Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

● (2000)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 161)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra	Anand
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Atwin
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baker
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bendayan	Bennett
Bergeron	Bérubé
Bessette	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Blanchette-Joncas	Blois
Boudrias	Bratina
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Champagne	Champoux

Charbonneau	Chen
Cormier	Dabrusin
Damoff	DeBellefeuille
Desbiens	Desilets
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Dong	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Fergus	Fillmore
Finnigan	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Garneau
Gaudreau	Gerretsen
Gill	Gould
Guilbeault	Hajdu
Hardie	Holland
Housefather	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Ien	Jaczek
Joly	Jones
Jordan	Jowhari
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Larouche
Lattanzio	Lauzon
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lefebvre	Lemire
Lightbound	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Marcel
Martinez Ferrada	May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon	McGuinty
McKay	McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendès	Medicino
Michaud	Miller
Monsef	Morrissey
Murray	Ng
Normandin	O'Connell
Oliphant	O'Regan
Paupé	Perron
Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon
Powlowski	Qualtrough
Regan	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Sahota (Brampton North)
Saini	Sajjan
Saks	Samson
Sangha	Sarai
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Schulte
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simard	Sorbara
Spengemann	Ste-Marie
Tabbara	Tassi
Thériault	Therrien
Trudeau	Trudel
Turnbull	Van Bynen
van Koevorden	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Vignola	Virani
Weiler	Wilkinson
Yip	Young

*Government Orders*Zahid
Zuberi— 183

Zann

Warkentin
Webber
Wilson-Raybould
YurdigaWaugh
Williamson
Wong
Zimmer— 142**NAYS**

Members

Aboultaif
Albas
Allison
Arnold
Bachrach
Barlow
Benzen
Berthold
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boulerice
Brassard
Cannings
Chiu
Cooper
Dalton
Davidson
Deltell
Diotte
Dowdall
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Findlay
Garrison
Généreux
Gladu
Gourde
Green
Harder
Hoback
Jansen
Johns
Kelly
Kitchen
Kram
Kusie
Lake
Lehoux
Liepert
Lobb
MacGregor
Maguire
Martel
Mathysen
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLean
McPherson
Moore
Morrison
Nater
Patzner
Poilievre
Rayes
Reid
Richards
Ruff
Saroya
Schmale
Shin
Sloan
Stanton
Strahl
Sweet
Van Popta
Vidal
Vis

Aitchison
Alleslev
Angus
Ashton
Baldinelli
Barrett
Bergen
Bezan
Blanchet
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Bragdon
Calkins
Carrie
Chong
Cumming
Dancho
Davies
d'Entremont
Doherty
Dreeshen
Duvall
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Gallant
Gazan
Genuis
Godin
Gray
Hallan
Harris
Hughes
Jeneroux
Julian
Kent
Kmiec
Kurek
Kwan
Lawrence
Lewis (Essex)
Lloyd
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
Manly
Masse
Mazier
McColeman
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Melillo
Morantz
Motz
O'Toole
Paul-Hus
Qaqqaq
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Rood
Sahota (Calgary Skyview)
Seheer
Shields
Shiple
Soroka
Steinley
Stubbs
Uppal
Vecchio
Viersen
Wagantall

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.*[English]*

BILL C-10—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

The House resumed from June 14 consideration of the motion, and of the amendment.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made earlier today, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of Government Business No. 10 before the House.

The question is on the amendment.

If a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes to request a recorded division, or that the amendment be adopted on division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I would request a recorded division.

● (2045)

[Translation]

(The House divided on the amendment, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 162)***YEAS**

Members

Aboultaif
Albas
Allison
Arnold
Barlow
Benzen
Berthold
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Bragdon
Calkins
Chiu
Cooper
Dalton
Davidson
d'Entremont
Doherty
Dreeshen
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Findlay
Généreux
Gladu
Gourde
Hallan
Hoback
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Kurek
Lawrence
Lewis (Essex)

Aitchison
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Baldinelli
Barrett
Bergen
Bezan
Block
Brassard
Carrie
Chong
Cumming
Dancho
Deltell
Diotte
Dowdall
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Gallant
Genuis
Godin
Gray
Harder
Jansen
Kelly
Kitchen
Kram
Kusie
Lehoux
Liepert

Government Orders

Lloyd	Lobb	Hajdu	Hardie
Lukiwski	MacKenzie	Harris	Holland
Maguire	Martel	Housefather	Hughes
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)	Hussen	Hutchings
McColeman	McLean	Iacono	Ien
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Melillo	Jaczek	Johns
Moore	Morantz	Joly	Jones
Morrison	Motz	Jordan	Jowhari
Nater	O'Toole	Julian	Kelloway
Patzer	Paul-Hus	Khalid	Khera
Poillievre	Rayes	Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Redekopp	Reid	Lake	Lalonde
Rempel Garner	Richards	Lambropoulos	Lametti
Rood	Ruff	Lamoureux	Larouche
Sahota (Calgary Skyview)	Saroya	Lattanzio	Lauzon
Scheer	Schmale	LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Shields	Shin	Lefebvre	Lemire
Shipley	Sloan	Lightbound	Long
Soroka	Stanton	Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
Steinley	Strahl	MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Stubbs	Sweet	Maloney	Manly
Tochor	Uppal	Marcil	Martinez Ferrada
Van Popta	Vecchio	Masse	Mathysen
Vidal	Viersen	May (Cambridge)	McCrimmon
Vis	Wagantall	McDonald	McGuinty
Warkentin	Waugh	McKay	McKenna
Webber	Williamson	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Wong	Yurdiga	McPherson	Mendès
Zimmer— 119		Medicino	Michaud

NAYS

Members

Alghabra	Anand	O'Connell	Oliphant
Angus	Arseneault	O'Regan	Pauzé
Arya	Ashton	Perron	Petitpas Taylor
Atwin	Bachrach	Plamondon	Powlowski
Badawey	Bagnell	Qaqqaq	Qualtrough
Bains	Barsalou-Duval	Ratansi	Regan
Battiste	Beaulieu	Robillard	Rodriguez
Beech	Bendayan	Rogers	Romanado
Bennett	Bergeron	Sahota (Brampton North)	Saini
Bérubé	Bessette	Sajjan	Saks
Bibeau	Bittle	Samson	Sangha
Blaikie	Blair	Sarai	Savard-Tremblay
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Blois	Boudrias	Schulte	Serré
Boulerice	Brière	Sgro	Shanahan
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings	Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Carr	Casey	Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Chabot	Chagger	Simms	Singh
Champagne	Champoux	Sorbara	Spengemann
Charbonneau	Chen	Ste-Marie	Tabbara
Cormier	Dabrusin	Tassi	Thériault
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens	Therrien	Trudeau
Desilets	Dhaliwal	Trudel	Turnbull
Dhillon	Dong	Van Bynen	van Koeverden
Drouin	Dubourg	Vandal	Vandenbeld
Duclos	Duguid	Vaughan	Vignola
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Duval	Virani	Weiler
Dzerowicz	Easter	Wilkinson	Wilson-Raybould
Ehsassi	El-Khoury	Yip	Young
Ellis	Erskine-Smith	Zahid	Zann
Fergus	Fillmore	Zuberi— 205	
Finnigan	Fisher		
Fonseca	Fortier		
Fortin	Fragiskatos		
Fraser	Freeland		
Fry	Garneau		
Garrison	Gaudreau		
Gazan	Gerretsen		
Gill	Gould		
Green	Guilbeault		

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.*[English]*

The next question is on the main motion.

If a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes to request a recorded division or that the motion be adopted on division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mr. Blake Richards: Mr. Speaker, I request a recorded division.

● (2100)

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 163)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra	Anand
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Atwin
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Bendayan
Bennett	Bergeron
Bérubé	Bessette
Bibeau	Bittle
Blair	Blanchet
Blanchette-Joncas	Blois
Boudrias	Bratina
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Champagne	Champoux
Charbonneau	Chen
Cormier	Dabrusin
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Desilets	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Dong
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz
Easter	El-Khoury
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Fergus	Fillmore
Finnigan	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Garneau
Gaudreau	Gerretsen
Gill	Gould
Hajdu	Hardie
Holland	Housefather
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Ien
Jaczek	Joly
Jones	Jordan
Jowhari	Kelloway
Khalid	Khera
Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Larouche	Lattanzio
Lauzon	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lefebvre
Lemire	Lightbound
Long	Longfield
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Marcil	Martinez Ferrada
May (Cambridge)	McCrimmon
McDonald	McGuinty
McKay	McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)

Mendès	Mendicino
Michaud	Miller
Morrissey	Murray
Ng	Normandin
O'Connell	Oliphant
O'Regan	Pauzé
Perron	Petitpas Taylor
Plamondon	Powlowski
Qualtrough	Ratansi
Regan	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Sahota (Brampton North)
Saini	Sajjan
Saks	Samson
Sangha	Sarai
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Schulte
Serré	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Simms	Sorbara
Spengemann	Ste-Marie
Tabbara	Tassi
Thériault	Therrien
Trudeau	Trudel
Turnbull	Van Bynen
van Koeverden	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Vignola	Virani
Weiler	Wilkinson
Yip	Young
Zahid	Zann
Zuberi— 181	

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Alleslev
Allison	Angus
Arnold	Ashton
Bachrach	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Benzen	Bergen
Berthold	Bezan
Blaikie	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Block
Boulerice	Bragdon
Brassard	Calkins
Cannings	Carrie
Chiu	Chong
Cooper	Cumming
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	Davies
Deltell	d'Entremont
Diotte	Doherty
Dowdall	Dreeschen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Duval
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Findlay	Gallant
Garrison	Gazan
Généreux	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Gourde	Gray
Green	Hallan
Harder	Harris
Hoback	Hughes
Jansen	Jeneroux
Johns	Julian
Kelly	Kent
Kitchen	Kmieciak
Kram	Kurek

Government Orders

Kusie	Kwan
Lawrence	Lehoux
Lewis (Essex)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Lukiwski	MacGregor
MacKenzie	Maguire
Manly	Martel
Masse	Mathysen
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McColeman	McLean
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	McPherson
Melillo	Moore
Morantz	Morrison
Motz	Nater
O'Toole	Patzer
Paul-Hus	Poilievre
Qaqqaq	Rayes
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Rood	Ruff
Sahota (Calgary Skyview)	Saroya
Schmale	Shields
Shin	Shipley
Singh	Sloan
Soroka	Stanton
Steinley	Strahl
Stubbs	Sweet
Tochor	Uppal
Van Popta	Vecchio
Vidal	Viersen
Vis	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Williamson
Wilson-Raybould	Wong
Yurdiga	Zimmer— 142

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

ROYAL ASSENT*[English]*

The Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a communication has been received as follows:

Rideau Hall
Ottawa

June 21, 2021

Mr. Speaker:

I have the honour to inform you that the Right Honourable Richard Wagner, Administrator of the Government of Canada, signified royal assent by written declaration to the bills listed in the schedule to this letter on the 21st day of June, 2021, at 6:35 p.m.

Yours sincerely,

Ian McCowan
Secretary to the Governor General

The schedule indicates the bills assented to were Bill C-210, An Act to amend the Canada Revenue Agency Act (organ and tissue donors); Bill C-8, An Act to amend the Citizenship Act (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada's call to action number 94); Bill C-15, An Act respecting the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples; Bill C-33, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the federal public administra-

tion for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2022; and Bill C-34, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the federal public administration for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2022.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

● (2105)

*[Translation]***CANADIAN NET-ZERO EMISSIONS ACCOUNTABILITY ACT**

NOTICE OF CLOSURE MOTION

Hon. Mona Fortier (Minister of Middle Class Prosperity and Associate Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with respect to consideration of Government Business No. 9, I give notice that at the next sitting of the House a minister of the Crown shall move, pursuant to Standing Order 57, that debate be not further adjourned.

* * *

BROADCASTING ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-10, An Act to amend the Broadcasting Act and to make related and consequential amendments to other Acts, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

[English]

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): There are 23 motions in amendment standing on the Notice Paper for the report stage of Bill C-10.

Motions Nos. 1 to 23 will be grouped for debate and voted upon according to the voting pattern available at the table.

MOTIONS IN AMENDMENT

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC) moved:

Motion No. 1

That Bill C-10 be amended by restoring Clause 3 as follows:

“4.1 (1) This Act does not apply in respect of

- (a) programs that are uploaded to an online undertaking that provides a social media service by a user of the service — who is not the provider of the service or the provider's affiliate, or the agent or mandatary of either of them — for transmission over the Internet and reception by other users of the service; and
- (b) online undertakings whose broadcasting consists only of such programs.

(2) For greater certainty, subsection (1) does not exclude the application of this Act in respect of a program that is the same as one referred to in paragraph (1)(a) but that is not uploaded as described in that paragraph.”

Motion No. 2

That Bill C-10, in Clause 7, be amended

- (a) by deleting lines 1 to 3 on page 12;
- (b) by replacing lines 34 and 35 on page 12 with the following:
 - “(3.1) Orders made under this section do not apply”

Motion No. 3

That Bill C-10, in Clause 7, be amended by adding after line 25 on page 12 the following:

Government Orders

“(1.1) For greater certainty, programming services exclude any service that allows users who are not carrying on broadcasting undertakings to upload programs such as those provided by web applications, social media platforms and smart devices.”

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.) moved:

That Bill C-10, in Clause 8, be amended by replacing lines 1 to 4 on page 14 with the following:

“(3) Paragraph 10(1)(b) of the Act is replaced by the following:

(b) prescribing what constitutes a Canadian program for the purposes of this Act and, in doing so, shall consider

(i) whether Canadians own and control intellectual property rights over Canadian programs for exploitation purposes, and retain a material and equitable portion of their value,

(ii) whether key creative positions are primarily held by Canadians,

(iii) whether Canadian artistic and cultural content and expression are supported,

(iv) whether, for the purpose of subparagraph (i), online undertakings and programming undertakings collaborate with:

(A) independent Canadian producers,

(B) a Canadian broadcaster producing its own content, or

(C) a producer affiliated with a Canadian broadcaster, and

(v) any other matter that may be prescribed by regulation;

(1.1) The Governor in Council may make regulations prescribing matters that the Commission is required to consider under subparagraph (1)(b)(v).”

• (2110)

Mr. Paul Manly (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, GP), seconded by the member for Edmonton Strathcona, moved:

That Bill C-10, in Clause 8, be amended by adding after line 39 on page 14 the following:

“(7.1) Subsection 10(1) of the Act is amended by adding the following after paragraph (g):

(g.1) prescribing the requirements for Canadian producers who are creating content for foreign undertakings and online undertakings that provide a social media service to be eligible to apply for the Canada Media Fund;”

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.) moved:

That Bill C-10, in Clause 8, be amended by adding after line 41 on page 14 the following:

(h.1) respecting unjust discrimination by a person carrying on a broadcasting undertaking and undue or unreasonable preference given, or undue or unreasonable disadvantage imposed, by such a person;

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paul Manly (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, GP), seconded by the member for Edmonton Strathcona, moved:

That Bill C-10, in Clause 8, be amended by adding after line 43 on page 14 the following:

“(i.1) respecting the establishment of a framework for contractual practices between independent producers and programming undertakings and online undertakings;”

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP) moved:

That Bill C-10, in Clause 8, be amended by adding after line 43 on page 14 the following:

“(i.1) respecting the establishment of a framework for contractual practices between independent and individual producers and programming undertakings and online undertakings;”

[*English*]

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-10, in Clause 8, be amended by adding after line 21 on page 15 the following:

“(4) Regulations made under this section do not apply with respect to programs that are uploaded to an online undertaking that provides a social media service by a user of the service — if that user is not the provider of the service or the provider’s affiliate, or the agent or mandatary of either of them — for transmission over the Internet and reception by other users of the service.”

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.) moved:

That Bill C-10, in Clause 8, be amended by adding after line 21 on page 15 the following:

(4) Regulations made under this section, other than regulations made under paragraph (1)(i) or (j), do not apply with respect to programs that are uploaded to an online undertaking that provides a social media service by a user of the service — if that user is not the provider of the service or the provider’s affiliate, or the agent or mandatary of either of them — for transmission over the Internet and reception by other users of the service.

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-10, in Clause 9, be amended by replacing lines 31 and 32 on page 16 with the following:

“to a broadcasting undertaking shall be fees that relate to the recovery”

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Shall I dispense?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. House leader of the official opposition.

• (2115)

Mr. Gérard Deltell: Madam Speaker, we all recognize that this is a huge job we have to do, and we want to be sure that we make the right decision at each and every step. I do not want to dodge our responsibility.

[*Translation*]

If we move too quickly, we might miss some parts.

Need I remind the House that the reason there are so many votes in the House this evening is that other people, at another time, did not do their job?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.) moved:

That Bill C-10, in Clause 10, be amended by replacing line 17 on page 17 with the following:

“Canadian audio or audio-visual programs, including independent productions, for broad-”

[*English*]

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP) moved:

That Bill C-10, in Clause 10, be amended by replacing lines 19 and 20 on page 17 with the following:

“(b) supporting, promoting or training Canadian creative and other human resources of audio or audio-visual programs for broadcast-”

Government Orders

[Translation]

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.) moved:

That Bill C-10, in Clause 10, be amended by adding after line 25 on page 17 the following:

“(1.1) Regulations made under paragraph (1)(a) must prescribe the minimum share of expenditures that must be allocated to Canadian original French language programs in the case of broadcasting undertakings that offer programs in both official languages.”

[English]

Mr. Paul Manly (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, GP), seconded by the hon. member for Edmonton Strathcona, moved:

That Bill C-10, in Clause 12, be amended by adding after line 7 on page 19 the following:

“(2) Paragraph 18(1)(d) of the Act is replaced by the following: « et 11.1(5)b) et la prise d’une ordonnance au titre des paragraphes 9.1(1) ou 12(2). »

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 16

That Bill C-10 be amended by adding after line 7 on page 19 the following:

12.1 Subsection 20(4) of the Act is replaced by the following:

(4) The members of a panel established under subsection (1) shall consult with the Commission, and may consult with any officer of the Commission, for the purpose of ensuring a consistency of interpretation of the broadcasting policy set out in subsection 3(1), the regulatory policy set out in subsection 5(2), the orders made under section 9.1, the regulations made under sections 10 and 11 and the regulations and orders made under section 11.1.

Motion No. 17

That Bill C-10, in Clause 21, be amended by adding after line 31 on page 24 the following:

Consultation and Review

34.01 (1) Every seven years the Commission shall consult with all interested persons with respect to orders made under section 9.1 and regulations and orders made under section 11.1 and shall publish, on the Internet or otherwise, a report on the consultations that also lists the orders and regulations that the Commission proposes to review as a result of the consultations and sets out its plan for conducting the review.

(2) The Commission shall publish the first report within seven years after the day on which this subsection comes into force and, subsequently, within seven years after the day on which the most recent report is published.

[Translation]

Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-10, in Clause 23, be amended by adding after line 33 on page 32 the following:

“(a.1) increasing the administrative monetary penalty amounts set out in subsection 34.5(1);”

Mr. Paul Manly (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, GP), seconded by the member for Edmonton Strathcona, moved:

That Bill C-10, in Clause 25, be amended by replacing line 5 on page 35 with the following:

“ternational service that includes the creation, production and distribution of programming targeted at audiences outside of Canada, in English, French and any other language deemed appropriate, in accordance with any directions that”

[English]

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 20

That Bill C-10, in Clause 33, be amended by replacing lines 23 to 31 on page 38 with the following:

as defined in subsection 2(1) of the Broadcasting Act; or (c) a distribution undertaking, as defined in subsection 2(1) of the Broadcasting Act, that is carried on lawfully under that Act, in respect of the programs that it originates. For greater certainty, it does not include an online undertaking, as defined in subsection 2(1) of the Broadcasting Act.

Motion No. 21

That Bill C-10 be amended by adding after line 31 on page 38 the following:

1997, c. 24, s. 18(1)

33.1 Subsection 30.9(7) of the Act is replaced by the following:

(7) In this section, “broadcasting undertaking” means a broadcasting undertaking, as defined in subsection 2(1) of the Broadcasting Act, that holds a broadcasting licence issued by the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission under that Act. For greater certainty, it does not include an online undertaking, as defined in that subsection 2(1).

● (2120)

[Translation]

Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-10 be amended by adding after line 17 on page 43 the following new clause:

“Review

46.1 (1) During the fifth year after this section comes into force, and every five years after that, a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act must be undertaken by the committee of the Senate, of the House of Commons or of both Houses of Parliament, that is designated or established for that purpose.

(2) The committee must, within one year after the review is undertaken — or within any further period that the Senate, the House of Commons or both Houses of Parliament, as the case may be, authorizes — submit a report on the review to the appropriate House or, in the case of a committee of both Houses, to each House, that includes a statement of any changes that the committee recommends.”

[English]

Mr. Paul Manly (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, GP), seconded by the member for Edmonton Strathcona, moved:

That Bill C-10 be amended by adding after line 17 on page 43 the following new clause:

“Review of Regulations

46.1 Within one year after the day on which this Act comes into force and every five years after that, the Commission must review what constitutes a Canadian program under the regulations.”

[Translation]

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to thank you for giving me the opportunity to rise after you presented the long list of amendments to all parliamentarians and the people who are watching at home. Canadians are interested in Bill C-10 and the whole saga surrounding it since its introduction.

I will not go back over all of the amendments that you just read, but I would like to talk about the key amendment, which seeks to reinstate protection for the freedom of expression of social media users. The government tried to attack freedom of expression, as many law professors and legal experts across the country have pointed out.

Before I talk about this key amendment, it is important to explain to people how we got to where we are today and why members will spend so much time this evening voting on many amendments.

Government Orders

The story began last November, when the Minister of Canadian Heritage introduced a bad bill in the House. Members of the House all wanted to pass legislation that would strike a balance between Canada's digital and conventional broadcasters.

Everyone put a little water in their wine. We found ways to allow all members who had concerns to have their say. This allowed us to get information from the various groups involved around the country. Some people may not know this, but the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage even unanimously agreed to form a pre-committee so as not to slow down the process at the beginning.

There was a willingness to find ways to improve this bad bill because it did not take into account the role of CBC/Radio-Canada nor the issue of copyright. There were several flaws and Canadian companies had no protection. We wanted to ensure that franco-phone and Canadian content was protected by certain safeguards, standards or basic criteria. There was nothing. If I remember correctly, the parties proposed more than 120 amendments, not counting the ones they added later.

Although the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons kept telling us that committees were independent, the minister, who is not supposed to interfere in committee business, suddenly decided on a Friday afternoon without warning to withdraw clause 3 entirely, which included proposed section 4.1. That removed the protection with respect to user content, including of small companies that use social media.

There is a lot of talk about YouTube, since that is something people understand. However, according to a memo from senior officials, this bill will affect all social networking platforms. Older people, and I would include myself in that group, since I have a few grey hairs, know about YouTube and TikTok, even though these networks are for younger people. However, this bill affects all of the other platforms young people use that we do not know about, such as social media games or all of the social networking tools that are not mentioned anywhere in the bill.

The real problem is that the government targeted freedom of expression. The minister and his Liberal members on the committee did everything they could to stop the Minister of Canadian Heritage and the Minister of Justice from testifying in committee and explaining why they wanted to withdraw clause 4.1. Work at the committee was stalled for two or three weeks as a result of members filibustering to force the government to explain itself and give us proof that freedom of expression was not in any jeopardy.

After three weeks, the Liberals on the committee ended up agreeing to have the ministers testify. Unfortunately, all we got was an explanatory document, not the legal opinion the motion had requested. That was yet another way the Liberals failed to honour the committee's wishes.

• (2125)

I think that the NDP members tried different ways of protecting freedom of expression, even if they did support Bill C-10. One NDP member, whom I am not allowed to name, but I forget the name of her riding, even suggested we work during the summer to improve this bad bill.

However, we suffered another serious blow when the government, with the support of the Bloc Québécois, which is important to point out, decided to impose time allocation for a bill whose core element was freedom of expression. Worse still, the time allocation imposed on the committee, which is supposed to be independent, was not even properly applied. The committee members, apart from those belonging to the Conservative Party, decided to reverse the decision of the committee chair, who was only reporting what the Speaker of the House had said, that members would have to vote in favour of the bill without even reading the 40-some amendments that were missing.

Therefore, we voted on the amendments one by one, without even reading them. The people who were interested in this controversial bill heard members say "yes" and "no" without even knowing what they were voting on. What a crazy story. This was completely contrary to what the Speaker and the House had decided.

In a dramatic turn of events, when the report was tabled in the House, we informed the Speaker that the committee had voted to overturn the Chair's ruling. The Chair agreed with us and overturned the 40 amendments we had voted on.

This means that we now have a bill in which some 40 amendments that attempted to correct its shortcomings were struck down after the vote. We are 48 hours away from the end of the session, and the government is trying to cram 20 or so amendments from several parties down our throats in just one hour of debate.

How will this play out? This bill will move on to the Senate. For the people who are listening to us, the Senate will not stand for this, as it is supposed to be independent. The Senate will therefore begin to study the whole matter from the beginning to make sure it was done right, because the government did not do its homework, because the government waited six years to introduce a bill, because the government did not listen to the recommendations of the various groups, because the government played partisan politics and suggested there was a war between the cultural community and freedom of expression and made the Conservatives look like the bad guys. Even members of the Green Party and the NDP spoke out against some of these tactics by the government, which, as we all know, with an election coming up in the fall, wants to play tough.

What is happening right now is really sad. We are being forced to rush votes on more than 20 amendments, some of which had already been rejected, and on the reinsertion of clause 4.1, which is the most important part. I hope my House of Commons colleagues will agree to vote in favour of that amendment at least. It will protect content created by social media users, which is what a number of former senior CRTC executives pushed for.

Government Orders

Law professors from several universities across the country condemned this bill. I hope people will listen to them, because we are headed for disaster. This will get hung up in the Senate, it will never get to a vote, and the legislative process will never be completed because of the fall election. The Liberals are setting us up for failure, and this will be challenged before artists can even get the help they have been asking for for so long.

• (2130)

[*English*]

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, there are parts on which I very much agree with my colleague. I agree this was flawed legislation. I agree the Liberal government did a terrible job in managing how the legislation came out and went through the process.

However, in committee, we went through the legislation and tried to fix it. I can talk about four amendments that we could have used to add protections to the legislation, and the Conservatives chose to filibuster. One of those amendments was a Conservative amendment, and they chose to filibuster instead of fixing the bill.

How can the member stand in this place and say that he really does want to do a good job on the bill when every attempt to fix the bill was thwarted by the Conservative members of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague who sits with me on the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage and who works very hard, as we all do. To answer her question, unfortunately I do not at all agree with her.

At first, we agreed on the principle of Bill C-10. The bill had several flaws and we were in a hurry to find common ground, but sadly, the government amended it along the way. I believe that is where the problem lies. The government, without notice and despite a pretense of collaboration, was paving the way so that social media could become official broadcasters with all the consequences that could have.

Even worse, the government's willingness to play partisan politics, by framing the issue as being between freedom of expression and the artists themselves, offended many people. Under no circumstance could we let the Liberals get away with that. We will always work to protect freedom of expression.

• (2135)

[*English*]

Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC): Madam Speaker, I have had a lot of phone calls and emails to my office. People are very concerned about what the government is doing.

I have a two-part question. First, if clause 4.1 were put back in the legislation, it would still be a flawed bill but would it be okay? Second, at this point, would the hon. member agree that the government should probably just put it aside, take its time and bring it back, whether in the fall or after another election?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for her question, which is more than relevant. It gives me an opportunity to come back to that subject.

We, the Conservatives, have been attacked a lot for opposing Bill C-10. However, when the government tried to demonize us for what we were saying, it attacked the thousands of Canadians across the country that wrote to us. The Liberals attacked the legal experts who raised red flags and said that this was a bad piece of legislation.

To come back to my colleague's question, clause 4.1 is the very least that needs to be done so that we can continue to work on Bill C-10. In the event that clause 4.1 is reinserted, there will still be work to be done to pass a real bill that meets the goal of protecting Canada's cultural community and ensuring that digital broadcasters, without touching social media, are able to contribute their fair share—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Order. We have just enough time for one last question.

[*English*]

Mr. Damien Kurek (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): Madam Speaker, my Conservative colleague articulates some of the concerns very well.

I have been very troubled to hear the Liberal minister time and again misleading the House by accusing Conservatives of obstruction and delay, when it is actually the Liberals' mismanagement of the legislative agenda that has led to the position we are in. The Liberals have basically shut down debate on a bill on censorship.

Specifically, I would ask the member to expand on how this is not about opposing artists, unlike what the minister suggests. The Conservative opposition to the bill is about ensuring that Canadians have freedom of speech and that this bill—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Richmond—Arthabaska has 15 seconds to answer.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Madam Speaker, these 15 seconds will not be nearly enough time. I will say, however, that the Conservatives will always fight for freedom of expression, not only for Canadians but also for our artists who want to have the freedom to write songs, say the things they want to say and put on the quality comedy shows that we all know.

Government Orders

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is a shame that I only get 10 minutes to speak to this legislation, with all those amendments. I will try to be as concise as I can and provide some thoughts in regard to the last speech and, in particular, that last amazing question from the Conservative member.

It is important to recognize at the beginning that the very core of Bill C-10, from my perspective and I believe the way my caucus colleagues look at it, is to promote Canadian music, storytelling and creative works. The bill is about fairness and getting American web giants to pay their fair share and contribute to our cultural sector. That is absolutely necessary.

Before I expand on that, it is a bit much to hear the Conservatives refer the legislative agenda and say that it has been mismanaged. It is somewhat ridiculous that the Conservative members would even suggest such a thing when they are at the core of the problem. The Conservatives will say that they do not have enough time to debate and will ask why the government is bringing in different forms of time allocation, yet it is the Conservative Party that consistently wastes time on the floor of the House of Commons. Last Thursday, we were just getting under way and the Conservatives tried to adjourn debate for the day, they wanted to stop debate. They did not want to work anymore, and we were only on a Thursday morning.

What about the motions for concurrence the Conservative Party continuously raise? What about the raising of privileges and points of order as a mechanism to filibuster on the floor of the House of Commons? Government business, unlike Private Members' Business or opposition days, has a process that makes it very vulnerable to opposition parties. Whenever there are 12 or more members, it makes it very difficult for government to pass legislation if one of those opposition parties wants to make it difficult.

The Conservative Party of Canada members in the House of Commons have made it their mission to prevent the government from passing anything. We have seen that destructive force in the House of Commons. I do not think they have a case whatsoever to complain about debate times on pieces of legislation. We tried on numerous occasions to bring certain bills up or to extend hours to facilitate their needs, but the Conservatives have said that if they cannot get what they want, they will waste time. The government then has to bring in some form of closure or time allocation or nothing will ever get passed. We have seen that, and Bill C-10 is one example. They need to wake up.

The minister has done a fantastic job of bringing forward to the House legislation that would modernize an act that has not been modernized for three decades. Is it absolutely perfect? There was some need to make some modifications. Some of those modifications have, in fact, occurred. However, the spin that the Conservatives put on this is that it is terrible legislation that should never, ever see the light of day. We know the legislation would never be able to pass if it did not get the support from at least one opposition party.

It is not the Government of Canada ramming the legislation through. Often it feels as if it is the Government of Canada pleading and begging opposition to recognize the value and try to drum up support within the House. Fortunately, once again, at least one political party is prepared to see this legislation advance. I truly do appreciate it.

● (2140)

Bill C-10, as I said, is, at the core, promoting Canadian music, storytelling and creative work. The Conservatives argue against it, that somehow it limits freedom of speech, and they cite a number of examples. However, the Department of Justice has done an analysis of the legislation and has clearly indicated that it is consistent with the charter guarantee of freedom of speech, and that is coming from civil servants.

I wish the Conservatives would recognize that the bill would ensure that the act would not apply to users of social media services or to social media services themselves for content posted by their users. However, to listen to what the Conservatives are saying, one would not think that, because it does not fit their narrative.

The bill aims to update some critical elements of the broadcasting policy for Canada. For example, it would ensure that the creation of Canadian content is reflective of Canadian society and accessible to all Canadians. The bill would also amend the act to ensure that there is a greater account for things such as indigenous cultures and languages. It would also recognize that Canada's broadcasting system should serve the needs and interests of all Canadians, including racialized communities and our very diverse ethnocultural backgrounds, socioeconomic status, abilities, disabilities, sexual orientations, gender identities and expressions of age.

I can tell my Conservative friends, in particular, that things have changed since the act was really updated. The Internet was in its infancy. When I first got the chance to speak to the legislation, I made reference to the fact that when I was first elected 30-plus years ago as a Manitoba parliamentarian, the Internet was accessed by dialing up through the telephone, and I think it was on a 256-kilobytes Compaq computer. Actually, I started off with a small Apple computer that I put floppy disks into. Contrast that to what the Internet is today and how advanced technology continues to push us. We, at least on the government benches, recognize that this is change that needs to take place.

Unlike the Conservative Party, we recognize the true, intrinsic value of culture and heritage, and Canada's diversity continues to grow on a daily basis. We need to modernize the legislation. It is there for all Canadians, which is the reason this government is bringing forward this legislation, as well as other important legislation, whether it is Bill C-6 or Bill C-12.

Government Orders

This is solid, progressive legislation that is going to make a tangible difference, and this is why it is so sad at times when we see the unholy alliance of opposition parties trying to frustrate the government in getting through a legislative agenda that we can all be proud of before the summer break, which is something that is done all the time in June when government gives that final push before the summer break.

I would ask members to get behind this legislation and do what I and my Liberal caucus colleagues are doing: support it, and let us move on to more legislation.

• (2145)

Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC): Madam Speaker, I duly note my colleague's remarks, but when he suggests that it is only the Conservatives who are opposed and that we are not modern, I would like to point out that there were some very significant witnesses who came to the hearings and testified against this bill. The government originally put in a very important clause, proposed section 4.1, for a reason. To be quite frank, I have never heard any clear rationale as to why it was removed, from anyone, including the minister.

My question is quite simple: Will my colleague vote for the reinsertion of proposed section 4.1 into the legislation?

• (2150)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, there are a number of amendments on the table. I understand there was somewhat of a filibuster, but a great discussion that occurred at the standing committee. I do not want to say that I know all of the details per se, but what I do know is that, all in all, this is good, solid legislation. At the end of the day, it is legislation that is needed, and the vast majority of Canadians would support it. We have seen examples, from the Quebec National Assembly to not only the government of the day, but also at least one and possibly even two opposition parties. Once again, the Conservatives seem to be on the outside. They are trying to frustrate the government from being able to pass any type of legislation, especially Bill C-10.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the parliamentary secretary what the date of the last election was. If memory serves, it was October 21, 2019. Since we have a law in this country that says that elections take place every four years and at least two opposition parties have said that they do not want an election in the midst of a pandemic, why is the Liberal government using a gag order that is unprecedented in the history of Canada and an emergency procedure on this bill if it is not trying to indicate that it wants a fall election?

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I have been a parliamentarian for about 30 years collectively. I can honestly say that when we get into the month of June, governments of all political stripes will often push to get legislation through before the month comes to an end. This government and this Prime Minister have consistently said that our first priority has been the pandemic, to ensure we have the backs of Canadians. At the same time, we can in fact push for important, progressive legislation and we look for that

progressive alliance inside the House of Commons to try to get this legislation through. If it was up to the Conservatives, it would never pass.

Mr. Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Madam Speaker, I have an article in front of me entitled “Heritage minister ignored his own officials over controversial Bill C-10, documents reveal”. It says:

Months before the Liberal government removed a section of Bill C-10 in a controversial amendment [the] Heritage Minister...was told by officials within his own department that it was an “important limitation” on regulatory powers.

What does the member say to all the critics of Bill C-10? It is not just the Conservatives, not just people on this side of the House who are criticizing this bill. What does he say to those people?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I would indicate to those people that we have a minister who has done an incredible job when it comes to consulting with Canadians from virtually coast to coast. This legislation was brought in with a great deal of background work done, not only by the minister and within the department, but also by the parliamentary secretary and many of my caucus colleagues, to ensure that sound legislation would ultimately be presented. I believe the minister has done a great service by providing this legislation to update and modernize something that needed to be modernized. As I said, the Internet has changed over the last 30 years.

• (2155)

Mr. Paul Manly (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, GP): Madam Speaker, it is an honour to rise to speak today to Bill C-10 on behalf of the constituents of Nanaimo—Ladysmith and the Green Party supporters across Canada.

It has been 29 years since the Broadcasting Act was updated, so this legislation is long overdue. I have decades of experience in music, film and the television industry, so I have a keen interest in seeing this update done correctly. However, Bill C-10 was critically flawed from the beginning.

More than 120 amendments were put forward to fix this bill, including 18 from the government itself. I submitted 29 amendments to Bill C-10. Two of these amendments passed, and another two passed with subamendments. The focus of my amendments was to ensure that industry stakeholders outside of the big media conglomerates are properly represented in the act. This included non-profit community broadcasters; independent producers who work outside of the traditional broadcasting system; small, independent production companies that create much of the content that we watch on the big networks; and independent networks, like APTN, which are not part of the media conglomerates like Bell, Rogers or Shaw.

Some of the key amendments I put forward ensured that the community element is recognized under the Broadcasting Act. The community element consists of hundreds of non-profit community TV and community radio stations across Canada. In Nanaimo, we have CHLY radio, which is a community-based campus radio station with a non-profit mandate that supports local, commercial-free programming.

When I started out in the broadcasting industry, there was a large network of community TV stations across the country, which were originally tied to the local community cable companies. As those small cable companies were swallowed up by Bell, Rogers and Shaw, the community broadcasting element was slowly pushed out. As the cable giants became more vertically integrated, buying up channels and production companies and expanding service into cellular, they started to use their community stations as a way to promote their own products.

Community media plays an important role in a free and democratic society. These stations are not owned and controlled by commercial interests, and their mandate is to provide a platform to community voices that would otherwise be squeezed out of commercial radio and television. It is important to have the community element recognized as the third major element of broadcasting in Canada. I was glad to have some of my amendments regarding the community element pass, although it was disappointing to see the term “non-profit” removed from the definition, because that is precisely what the community element is, a non-profit element of our broadcasting system.

There has been a lot of talk by the government about the objective of this bill being to level the playing field and protect Canadian cultural producers in their relationship to large Internet giants. According to the Yale report, which was presented in committee, the playing field also needs to be levelled in the contractual agreements between independent production companies and large broadcasting or streaming services.

Much of what we watch is created by small, independent production companies that bring their program ideas to the big companies. There is a power imbalance in the system that needs to be corrected. Two amendments I put forward were recommended by the Coalition for the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, the Alliance des producteurs francophones du Canada, and the Canadian Media Producers Association. Had they passed, those amendments would have created market-based solutions to a market-based power imbalance.

The U.K and France both have similar systems in place, which are working quite well. After the British Parliament passed legislation, the U.K. regulatory agency required negotiations of codes of practice between independent producers and the public service broadcasters. Every code of practice agreement was worked out by the players themselves, rather than dictated by the regulator. The result was a tripling of the size of the domestic production industry in under a decade. France implemented similar measures, with the effect being that the volume of independently produced productions has continually increased, including those commissioned by web giants like Netflix and Amazon.

Government Orders

In Canada, the CRTC has never attempted to directly regulate the commercial relationship between producers and broadcasters. It has always taken the position that codes of practice should be negotiated by the market actors concerned. It is essential, however, that the CRTC be given explicit authority in this area so that it can require players to negotiate codes of practice between themselves. Unfortunately, those amendments, which would have provided more protection to small producers, were opposed by both the Liberals and the Conservatives and did not pass.

● (2200)

There is no doubt that the Broadcasting Act needs to be modernized and we need to level the playing field to ensure that digital giants pay their fair share. For decades now we have had a system in which the broadcasting industry supports the creation of Canadian content, and this should extend to the Internet giants.

Currently, the streaming and social media giants get away with not paying their fair share of taxes in this country. They also contribute nothing to the creation of content except that which they choose to produce.

The Conservatives have been busy sowing a great deal of confusion about what is and what is not Canadian content and how that is determined. Our Canadian content rules are very straightforward. For music to be deemed Canadian content, there is the MAPL system.

To qualify as Canadian content, a musical selection must generally fulfill at least two of the following conditions: M, or music, means that the music is composed entirely by a Canadian; A, or the artist, is for when the music or the lyrics are performed principally by a Canadian; P, or performance, is when the music selection consists of a live performance that is recorded wholly in Canada or performed wholly in Canada and broadcast live in Canada; and L, is when the lyrics are written entirely by a Canadian.

If we fulfill two out of those four categories, we have Canadian content. It is pretty straightforward. Canadian content rules have made stars out of some great Canadian bands such as The Tragical Hip, a band whose lyrics are distinctly Canadian. Tragically, The Hip never made it big in the U.S.A., but it is great that they have become such Canadian icons, thanks to Canadian content regulations that led to the production of films that were later picked up by Canadian broadcasters and went through the procedure of having the film certified as Canadian content.

It is an attestation-based process where one makes a declaration, and it may or may not be audited in the future. There is a point system where people have must score six out of a possible 10 points. They get two points for a director, two points for the screenwriter, first and second lead performers at one point each, and points are awarded for production design, art design, the director of photograph, camera chief, camera operator, musical composer, etc.

Government Orders

The Conservatives spent a lot of time filibustering at committee asking how anyone could figure out if a production is Canadian or not. In question period, the member for Lethbridge wanted to know if *Canadian Bacon* was a Canadian film based on the name and one of the lead actors, John Candy, being Canadian. However, *Canadian Bacon* was produced and directed by Michael Moore, an American, and it was produced mostly with an American crew.

Yes, John Candy was one of the stars, and there was another lesser known but also great Canadian actor Adrian Hough in the film, but other than that, there was a long list of American stars like Alan Alda. According to the formula, *Canadian Bacon* was not a Canadian film, but it is a very straightforward system.

Social media users are exempt from Bill C-10 and the Broadcasting Act, but the content they upload to social media platforms would be covered under the act. It should be noted that under current CRTC rules, productions under five minutes or less do not require certification as Canadian content. TikTok videos and Instagram videos, which are all less than five minutes, would not fall under the current regulations for discoverability as Canadian content.

Can regulations under the act change? Yes, they can. Does the CRTC think it is a good idea to regulate TikTok and Instagram videos for Canadian content discoverability? I really doubt it. There is an ongoing debate about whether freedom of expression is protected under the Broadcasting Act. In the 1991 Broadcasting Act under part 1, the general interpretation, it states, “This Act shall be construed and applied in a manner that is consistent with the freedom of expression and journalistic, creative and programming independence enjoyed by broadcasting undertakings.”

This part of the act still stands. The CRTC is going to have to respect our constitutional right to freedom of expression under the act. That is just a fact. If it does not, then there will be grounds for a legal challenge to the bill, and it seems pretty clear that freedom of expression will be respected.

In conclusion, Bill C-10 is still flawed and there could be a lot more in the bill to protect small, independent producers and production companies, and to ensure that independent networks such as APTN get their products on those streaming services, so we need to do more to protect Canadian producers and defend them in their relationship to the big companies, and not just the big Internet companies, but also the big Canadian broadcasters.

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, it was a pleasure to work with the member on Bill C-10. He obviously cares about the Broadcasting Act, the broadcasting landscape, our creative producers in Canada, our artists, our writers and our community broadcasting stations. That was something that I was fighting for at committee, so we were often working hand in hand on some of that work.

However, that was not the case with all members of our committee. In early spring, we saw the Conservatives begin to filibuster, and I believe that was as a result of the minister's mishandling and inability to defend his own legislation. Does the member think that the Conservatives actually found an opportunity to fundraise off this? Does the member think that is why they in fact stopped being productive and stopped trying to fix the legislation and just obstructed the legislation?

• (2205)

Mr. Paul Manly: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for her great work on this committee as well. The committee was doing very good work at the beginning. We were going through these amendments, and I had a chance to defend them.

Once we hit one part of the act where it seemed like freedom of expression might be threatened if one had not read the original act, the Conservatives smelled blood in the water and away they went on their fundraising rampage.

I have seen lots of emails come in about this. People are concerned that freedom of expression is under threat under this act, but I do not believe it is. It is unfortunate because there are a lot of things that could be improved under this act that have not been improved, and it would have been great to have a good fulsome debate on the last 40 or so amendments that were left hanging.

Ms. Nelly Shin (Port Moody—Coquitlam, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am a little concerned about the way Conservatives' intervention on this bill is being interpreted. I am really disappointed that it is being reduced to a fundraising effort and that this is how it has been interpreted.

Clearly there has been a breach of the tools and the institution of democracy throughout this Parliament, and this is just one example of those being breached. As an artist, I am very disappointed. I feel we were forced to choose between spending more time talking about the artists and fighting for democracy. That should not even be an issue, but the fact we had to really bothers me, so I would—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): We are at the time where we have to end the debate, so I would like to allow the hon. member to respond quickly.

The member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith has time for a brief response.

Mr. Paul Manly: Madam Speaker, I had a lot of frustration in the committee process, listening to the Conservatives go on and on and on for an hour at a time about what Canadian content is and how one figures that out. I read them the act, which I just read here, and the regulations on how one determines whether music is Canadian content and whether a video or a film production is Canadian content. It is such a simple system: check, check, check, check, and boom, it is done. As well—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Unfortunately, we are out of time. I do apologize.

It being 10:08 p.m., pursuant to order made earlier today, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the report stage of the bill now before the House.

*Government Orders**[Translation]*

The hon. member for Drummond on a point of order.

Mr. Martin Champoux: Madam Speaker, the Bloc Québécois did not get its turn to rise in this debate. I think there must have been some mistake.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I apologize, but only one hour was provided for debate. It depends on the manner in which the debate unfolds. Right now, we need to move on to the votes.

The question is on Motion No. 1.

• (2210)

If a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes to request a recorded division or that the motion be adopted on division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands.

[English]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded division.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The question is on Motion No. 2. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 3, 9 and 11. A negative vote on Motion No. 2 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 10.

[Translation]

If a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes to request a recorded division or that the motion be adopted on division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands.

[English]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded division.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

[Translation]

The question is on Motion No. 4. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 6, 12, 14, 16, 17, 20 and 21.

[English]

If a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes to request a recorded division or that the motion be adopted on division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, I request a record division.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

[Translation]

The question is on Motion No. 5. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 7, 15, 19 and 23. A negative vote on Motion No. 5 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 8.

[English]

If a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes to request a recorded division or that the motion be adopted on division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded division.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

[Translation]

The question is on Motion No. 13.

If a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes to request a recorded division or that the motion be adopted on division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands.

• (2215)

[English]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded division.

[Translation]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The question is on Motion No. 18.

If a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes to request a recorded division or that the motion be adopted on division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

The hon. member for Drummond.

Mr. Martin Champoux: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded division.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

[English]

The question is on Motion No. 22.

If a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes to request a recorded division on that motion or that the motion be adopted on division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[Translation]

Mr. Martin Champoux: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded division.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded divisions at report stage of the bill.

• (2245)

[English]

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 1.

Government Orders

● (2300)

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 164)***YEAS**

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Alleslev
Allison	Arnold
Baldinelli	Barlow
Barrett	Benzen
Bergin	Berthold
Bezan	Block
Bragdon	Brassard
Calkins	Carrie
Chiu	Chong
Cooper	Cumming
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	Deltell
d'Entremont	Diotte
Doherty	Dowdall
Dreeshen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Findlay	Gallant
Généreux	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Gourde	Gray
Hallan	Harder
Hoback	Jansen
Kelly	Kent
Kitchen	Kmiec
Kram	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Lawrence	Lehoux
Lewis (Essex)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Lukiwski	MacKenzie
Maguire	Martel
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McColeman	McLean
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Melillo
Moore	Morantz
Morrison	Motz
Nater	O'Toole
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Poillievre	Rayes
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Rood	Ruff
Sahota (Calgary Skyview)	Saroya
Scheer	Schmale
Shields	Shin
Shipley	Sloan
Soroka	Stanton
Steinley	Strahl
Stubbs	Sweet
Tochor	Uppal
Van Popta	Vecchio
Vidal	Viersen
Vis	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Williamson
Wilson-Raybould	Wong
Zimmer— 117	

NAYS

Members

Alghabra	Anand
----------	-------

Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baker
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bendayan	Bennett
Bergeron	Bérubé
Bessette	Bibeau
Bittle	Blaikie
Blair	Blanchet
Blanchette-Joneas	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Blois	Boudrias
Boulerice	Bratina
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe
Cannings	Carr
Casey	Chabot
Chagger	Champagne
Champoux	Charbonneau
Chen	Cormier
Dabrusin	DeBellefeuille
Desbiens	Desilets
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Dong	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duvall	Dzerowicz
Easter	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Ellis
Fergus	Fillmore
Finnigan	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Garneau
Garrison	Gaudreau
Gerretsen	Gill
Gould	Guilbeault
Hajdu	Hardie
Harris	Holland
Housefather	Hughes
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Ien
Jaczek	Johns
Joly	Jones
Jordan	Jowhari
Julian	Kelloway
Khalid	Khera
Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Larouche	Lattanzio
Lauzon	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lefebvre
Lemire	Lightbound
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Manly	Martinez Ferrada
Masse	Mathysen
May (Cambridge)	McCrimmon
McDonald	McGuinty
McKay	McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	McPherson
Mendès	Medicino
Michaud	Miller
Monsef	Morrissey
Murray	Ng
Normandin	O'Connell
Oliphant	O'Regan
Paupé	Perron
Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon

Powlowski
Qualtrough
Regan
Rodriguez
Romanado
Saini
Saks
Sangha
Savard-Tremblay
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Tassi
Therrien
Trudel
Van Bynen
Vandal
Vaughan
Virani
Wilkinson
Young
Zann

Qaqqaq
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Sahota (Brampton North)
Sajjan
Samson
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tabbara
Thériault
Trudeau
Turnbull
van Koeverden
Vandenbeld
Vignola
Weiler
Yip
Zahid
Zuberi— 200

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

The question is on Motion No. 2. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 3, 9, and 11. A negative vote on Motion No. 2 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 10.

The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it you will find consent to apply the results from the previous vote to this vote, with the Liberal members voting no.

Mr. Blake Richards: Mr. Speaker, we would agree to apply the vote, and Conservative members will be supporting.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Martin Champoux: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will vote against.

[*English*]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will be voting nay.

Mr. Paul Manly: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply the vote, and we will be voting no.

Mr. Marwan Tabbara: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting no.

Ms. Yasmin Ratansi: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and I will be voting no.

● (2305)

Mr. Ramesh Sangha: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the vote, and I vote nay.

(The House divided on Motion No. 2, which was negated on the following division:)

Government Orders

(Division No. 165)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Albas
Allison
Baldinelli
Barrett
Bergen
Bezan
Bragdon
Calkins
Chiu
Cooper
Dalton
Davidson
d'Entremont
Doherty
Dreeschen
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Findlay
Généreux
Gladu
Gourde
Hallan
Hoback
Kelly
Kitchen
Kram
Kusie
Lawrence
Lewis (Essex)
Lloyd
Lukiwski
Maguire
Mazier
McColeman
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Moore
Morrison
Nater
Patzner
Poilievre
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Rood
Sahota (Calgary Skyview)
Scheer
Shields
Shiple
Stanton
Strahl
Sweet
Uppal
Vecchio
Viersen
Wagantall
Waugh
Williamson
Wong

Aitchison
Alleslev
Arnold
Barlow
Benzen
Berthold
Block
Brassard
Carrie
Chong
Cumming
Dancho
Deltell
Diotte
Dowdall
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Gallant
Gentis
Godin
Gray
Harder
Jansen
Kent
Kmiec
Kurek
Lake
Lehoux
Liepert
Lobb
MacKenzie
Martel
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLean
Melillo
Morantz
Mutz
O'Toole
Paul-Hus
Rayes
Reid
Richards
Ruff
Saroya
Schmale
Shin
Soroka
Steinley
Stubbs
Tochor
Van Popta
Vidal
Vis
Warkentin
Webber
Wilson-Raybould
Zimmer— 116

NAYS

Members

Alghabra
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Badawey
Bains

Anand
Angus
Arya
Atwin
Bagnell
Baker

Ms. Yasmin Ratansi: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and I will be voting no.

Mr. Marwan Tabbara: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and I will be voting in favour.

Mr. Paul Manly: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and I will be voting yes.

Mr. Ramesh Sangha: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and I will be voting nay.

● (2310)

(The House divided on Motion No. 10, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 166)

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison	Fortier	Fortin
Albas	Alghabra	Fragiskatos	Fraser
Alleslev	Allison	Freeland	Fry
Anand	Anandasangaree	Gallant	Garneau
Angus	Arnold	Garrison	Gaudreau
Arseneault	Arya	Généreux	Genuis
Ashton	Atwin	Gerretsen	Gill
Badawey	Bagnell	Gladu	Godin
Bains	Baker	Gould	Gourde
Baldinelli	Barlow	Gray	Guilbeault
Barrett	Barsalou-Duval	Hajdu	Hallan
Battiste	Beaulieu	Harder	Hardie
Beech	Bendayan	Harris	Hoback
Bennett	Benzen	Holland	Housefather
Bergen	Bergeron	Hughes	Hussen
Berthold	Bérubé	Hutchings	Iacono
Bessette	Bezan	Ien	Jaczek
Bibeau	Bittle	Jansen	Johns
Blaikie	Blair	Joly	Jones
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas	Jordan	Jowhari
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Block	Julian	Kelloway
Blois	Boudrias	Kelly	Kent
Boulerice	Bragdon	Khalid	Khera
Brassard	Bratina	Kitchen	Kmiec
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe	Koutrakis	Kram
Calkins	Cannings	Kurek	Kusie
Carr	Carrie	Kusmierczyk	Lake
Casey	Chabot	Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Chagger	Champagne	Lametti	Lamoureux
Champoux	Charbonneau	Larouche	Lattanzio
Chen	Chiu	Lauzon	Lawrence
Chong	Cooper	LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Cormier	Cumming	Lefebvre	Lehoux
Dabrusin	Dalton	Lemire	Lewis (Essex)
Dancho	Davidson	Liepert	Lightbound
DeBellefeuille	Deltell	Lloyd	Lobb
d'Entremont	Desbiens	Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
Desilets	Dhaliwal	Lukiwski	MacAulay (Cardigan)
Dhillon	Diotte	MacGregor	MacKenzie
Doherty	Dong	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maguire
Dowdall	Dreeshen	Maloney	Manly
Drouin	Dubourg	Martel	Martinez Ferrada
Duclos	Duguid	Masse	Mathysen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Duncan (Etobicoke North)	May (Cambridge)	Mazier
Duvall	Dzerowicz	McCauley (Edmonton West)	McColeman
Easter	Ehsassi	McCrimmon	McDonald
El-Khoury	Ellis	McGuinty	McKay
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	McKenna	McLean
Falk (Provencher)	Fast	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Fergus	Fillmore	McPherson	Melillo
Findlay	Finnigan	Mendès	Mendicino
Fisher	Fonseca	Michaud	Miller
		Monsef	Moore
		Morantz	Morrison
		Morrissey	Motz
		Murray	Nater
		Ng	Normandin
		O'Connell	Oliphant
		O'Regan	O'Toole
		Patzer	Paul-Hus
		Pauzé	Perron
		Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon
		Poillievre	Powlowski
		Qaqqaq	Qualtrough
		Rayes	Redekopp
		Regan	Reid
		Rempel Garner	Richards
		Robillard	Rodriguez
		Rogers	Romanado
		Rood	Ruff
		Sahota (Calgary Skyview)	Sahota (Brampton North)
		Saini	Sajjan
		Saks	Samson

Government Orders

Government Orders

Sarai	Saroya
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
Scheer	Schieffe
Schmale	Schulte
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Shields	Shin
Shipley	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Simms	Sloan
Sorbara	Soroka
Spengemann	Stanton
Steinley	Ste-Marie
Strahl	Stubbs
Sweet	Tabbara
Tassi	Thériault
Therrien	Tochor
Trudeau	Trudel
Turnbull	Uppal
Van Bynen	van Koevorden
Van Popta	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Vecchio	Vidal
Viersen	Vignola
Virani	Vis
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Weiler	Wilkinson
Williamson	Wong
Yip	Young
Zahid	Zann
Zimmer	Zuberi— 314

NAYS

Members

Ratansi
Wilson-Raybould— 3

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 10 carried.

Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould: Mr. Speaker, I was waiting to be acknowledged on the previous vote. When that did not happen, I raised my hand to be acknowledged. I was voting for the previous motion.

The Speaker: We have finished the vote. We have to have unanimous consent.

I just want to remind hon. members to raise their hands to be acknowledged. It does not just happen. I have to be aware that they are in the chamber or here virtually.

Could the hon. member for Vancouver Granville clarify if that was a yea or nay? The table just wants to confirm.

Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould: Mr. Speaker, that was a yea.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 4. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 6, 12, 14, 16, 17, 20 and 21.

The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it you will find consent to apply the results from the previous vote to this vote, with Liberals members voting yea.

Mr. Blake Richards: Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply the vote with Conservatives voting against.

[Translation]

Mr. Martin Champoux: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will vote in favour of the motion.

[English]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply and will be voting yea.

Mr. Marwan Tabbara: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting in favour.

Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting no.

Ms. Yasmin Ratansi: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and I will be voting yes.

Mr. Paul Manly: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and I will be voting yes.

Mr. Derek Sloan: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and I will be voting no.

Mr. Ramesh Sangha: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and I will be voting nay.

● (2315)

(The House divided on Motion No. 4, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 167)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baker
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bendayan	Bennett
Bergeron	Bérubé
Bessette	Bibau
Bittle	Blaikie
Blair	Blanchet
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Blois	Boudrias
Boulerice	Bratina
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe
Cannings	Carr
Casey	Chabot
Chagger	Champagne
Champoux	Charbonneau
Chen	Cormier
Dabrusin	DeBellefeuille
Desbiens	Desilets
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Dong	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duvall	Dzerowicz
Easter	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Ellis
Fergus	Fillmore
Finnigan	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Garneau

Government Orders

Garrison	Gaudreau	Bezan	Block
Gerretsen	Gill	Bragdon	Brassard
Gould	Guilbeault	Calkins	Carrie
Hajdu	Hardie	Chiu	Chong
Harris	Holland	Cooper	Cumming
Housefather	Hughes	Dalton	Dancho
Hussen	Hutchings	Davidson	Deltell
Iacono	Ien	d'Entremont	Diotte
Jaczek	Johns	Doherty	Dowdall
Joly	Jones	Dreeshen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Jordan	Jowhari	Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Julian	Kelloway	Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Khalid	Khera	Findlay	Gallant
Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk	Généreux	Genuis
Lalonde	Lambropoulos	Gladu	Godin
Lametti	Lamoureux	Gourde	Gray
Larouche	Lattanzio	Hallan	Harder
Lauzon	LeBlanc	Hoback	Jansen
Lebouthillier	Lefebvre	Kelly	Kent
Lemire	Lightbound	Kitchen	Kmiec
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	Kram	Kurek
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacGregor	Kusie	Lake
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney	Lawrence	Lehoux
Manly	Martinez Ferrada	Lewis (Essex)	Liepert
Masse	Mathysen	Lloyd	Lobb
May (Cambridge)	McCrimmon	Lukiwski	MacKenzie
McDonald	McGuinty	Maguire	Martel
McKay	McKenna	Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	McPherson	McColeman	McLean
Mendès	Mendicino	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Melillo
Michaud	Miller	Moore	Morantz
Monsef	Morrissey	Morrison	Motz
Murray	Ng	Nater	O'Toole
Normandin	O'Connell	Patzner	Paul-Hus
Oliphant	O'Regan	Poilievre	Raves
Pauzé	Perron	Redekopp	Reid
Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon	Rempel Garner	Richards
Powlowski	Qaqqaq	Rood	Ruff
Qualtrough	Ratansi	Sahota (Calgary Skyview)	Sangha
Regan	Robillard	Saroya	Scheer
Rodriguez	Rogers	Schmale	Shields
Romanado	Sahota (Brampton North)	Shin	Shiple
Saini	Sajjan	Sloan	Soroka
Saks	Samson	Stanton	Steinley
Sarai	Savard-Tremblay	Strahl	Stubbs
Scarpaleggia	Schieffe	Sweet	Tochor
Schulte	Serré	Uppal	Van Popta
Sgro	Shanahan	Vecchio	Vidal
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Viersen	Vis
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard	Wagantall	Warkentin
Simms	Sorbara	Waugh	Webber
Spengemann	Ste-Marie	Williamson	Wilson-Raybould
Tabbara	Tassi	Wong	Zimmer— 118
Thériault	Therrien		
Trudeau	Trudel		
Turnbull	Van Bynen		
van Koevorden	Vandal		
Vandenbeld	Vaughan		
Vignola	Virani		
Weiler	Wilkinson		
Yip	Young		
Zahid	Zann		
Zuberi— 199			

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 4 carried. I therefore declare Motions No. 6, 12, 14, 16, 17, 20 and 21 carried.

The question is now on Motion No. 5. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 7, 15, 19 and 23.

[Translation]

A negative vote on Motion No. 5 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 8.

[English]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it, you will find consent to apply the results from the previous vote to this one, with Liberal members voting no.

NAYS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Alleslev
Allison	Arnold
Baldinelli	Barlow
Barrett	Benzen
Bergen	Berthold

*Government Orders**[Translation]*

Mr. Blake Richards: Mr. Speaker, Conservative members agree to apply the vote and will vote against the motion.

Mr. Martin Champoux: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour of the motion.

[English]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agree to apply this vote and will be voting yea.

Mr. Marwan Tabbara: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting no.

Ms. Yasmin Ratansi: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and I will be voting no.

Mr. Paul Manly: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and I will be voting yes.

[Translation]

Hon. Steven Blaney: Mr. Speaker, I would like to vote against the motion and would ask that the following votes be tallied with those of the Conservative Party.

[English]

Mr. Ramesh Sangha: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and I will be voting nay.

Mr. Derek Sloan: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and I will be voting no.

(The House divided on Motion No. 5, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 168)

YEAS

Members

Angus	Ashton
Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Bergeron	Bérubé
Blaikie	Blanchet
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boudrias	Boulerice
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Chabot	Champoux
Charbonneau	DeBellefeuille
Desbiens	Desilets
Duval	Fortin
Garrison	Gaudreau
Gill	Harris
Hughes	Johns
Julian	Larouche
Lemire	MacGregor
Manly	Masse
Mathysen	McPherson
Michaud	Normandin
Pauzé	Perron
Plamondon	Qaqqaq
Savard-Tremblay	Simard
Ste-Marie	Thériault
Therrien	Trudel
Vignola— 49	

NAYS

Members

Aboulttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Alghabra

Alleslev	Allison
Anand	Anandasangaree
Arnold	Arseneault
Arya	Atwin
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baker
Baldinelli	Barlow
Barrett	Battiste
Beech	Bendayan
Bennett	Benzen
Bergen	Berthold
Bessette	Bezan
Bibeau	Bittle
Blair	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Block	Blois
Bragdon	Brassard
Bratina	Brière
Calkins	Carr
Carrie	Casey
Chagger	Champagne
Chen	Chiu
Chong	Cooper
Cormier	Cumming
Dabrusin	Dalton
Dancho	Davidson
Deltell	d'Entremont
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diotte	Doherty
Dong	Dowdall
Dreeschen	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz
Easter	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Fergus	Fillmore
Findlay	Finnigan
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Gallant
Garneau	Généreux
Genuis	Gerretsen
Gladu	Godin
Gould	Gourde
Gray	Guilbeault
Hajdu	Hallan
Harder	Hardie
Hoback	Holland
Housefather	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Ien	Jaczek
Jansen	Joly
Jones	Jordan
Jowhari	Kelloway
Kelly	Kent
Khalid	Khera
Kitchen	Kmiec
Koutrakis	Kram
Kurek	Kusie
Kusmierczyk	Lake
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lattanzio	Lauzon
Lawrence	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lefebvre
Lehoux	Lewis (Essex)
Liepert	Lightbound
Lloyd	Lobb
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
Lukowski	MacAulay (Cardigan)

Government Orders

MacKenzie	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maguire	Maloney
Martel	Martinez Ferrada
May (Cambridge)	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McColeman
McCrimmon	McDonald
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McLean
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Melillo	Mendès
Mendicino	Miller
Monsef	Moore
Morantz	Morrison
Morrissey	Motz
Murray	Nater
Ng	O'Connell
Oliphant	O'Regan
O'Toole	Patzner
Paul-Hus	Petitpas Taylor
Poilievre	Powlowski
Qualtrough	Ratansi
Rayes	Redekopp
Regan	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Rood	Ruff
Sahota (Calgary Skyview)	Sahota (Brampton North)
Saini	Sajjan
Saks	Samson
Sangha	Sarai
Saroya	Scarpaleggia
Scheer	Schieffe
Schmale	Schulte
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Shields	Shin
Shiplay	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simms
Sloan	Sorbara
Soroka	Spengemann
Stanton	Steinley
Strahl	Stubbs
Sweet	Tabbara
Tassi	Tochor
Trudeau	Turnbull
Uppal	Van Bynen
van Koeverden	Van Popta
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Vecchio
Vidal	Viersen
Virani	Vis
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Weiler	Wilkinson
Williamson	Wong
Yip	Young
Zahid	Zann
Zimmer	Zuberi — 268

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 5 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 7, 15, 19 and 23 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 8.

• (2320)

Mr. Blake Richards: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it, you will find unanimous consent to apply the previous vote to this vote, and Conservatives would be opposed.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, we would agree to apply, with the Liberals voting no.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Martin Champoux: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour of the motion.

[*English*]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply and will be voting yea.

Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting no.

Mr. Marwan Tabbara: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting no.

Ms. Yasmin Ratansi: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and I will be voting no.

Mr. Paul Manly: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply and will be voting yes.

Mr. Derek Sloan: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting no.

Mr. Ramesh Sangha: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and I will be voting no.

(The House divided on Motion No. 8, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 169*)

YEAS

Members

Angus	Ashton
Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Bergeron	Bérubé
Blaikie	Blanchet
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boudrias	Boulerice
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Chabot	Champoux
Charbonneau	DeBellefeuille
Desbiens	Desilets
Duvall	Fortin
Garrison	Gaudreau
Gill	Harris
Hughes	Johns
Julian	Larouche
Lemire	MacGregor
Manly	Masse
Mathyssen	McPherson
Michaud	Normandin
Pauzé	Perron
Plamondon	Qaqqaq
Savard-Tremblay	Simard
Ste-Marie	Thériault
Therrien	Trudel
Vignola — 49	

NAYS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
-----------	-----------

Government Orders

Albas	Alghabra	Lukiwski	MacAulay (Cardigan)
Alleslev	Allison	MacKenzie	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Anand	Anandasangaree	Maguire	Maloney
Arnold	Arseneault	Martel	Martinez Ferrada
Arya	Atwin	May (Cambridge)	Mazier
Badawey	Bagnell	McCauley (Edmonton West)	McColeman
Bains	Baker	McCrimmon	McDonald
Baldinelli	Barlow	McGuinty	McKay
Barrett	Battiste	McKenna	McLean
Beech	Bendayan	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Bennett	Benzen	Melillo	Mendès
Bergen	Berthold	Mendicino	Miller
Bessette	Bezan	Monsef	Moore
Bibeau	Bittle	Morantz	Morrison
Blair	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Morrissey	Motz
Block	Blois	Murray	Nater
Bragdon	Brassard	Ng	O'Connell
Bratina	Brière	Oliphant	O'Regan
Calkins	Carr	O'Toole	Patzner
Carrie	Casey	Paul-Hus	Petitpas Taylor
Chagger	Champagne	Poilievre	Powlowski
Chen	Chiu	Qualtrough	Ratansi
Chong	Cooper	Raves	Redekopp
Cormier	Cumming	Regan	Reid
Dabrusin	Dalton	Rempel Garner	Richards
Dancho	Davidson	Robillard	Rodriguez
Deltell	d'Entremont	Rogers	Romanado
Dhaliwal	Dhillon	Rood	Ruff
Diotte	Doherty	Sahota (Calgary Skyview)	Sahota (Brampton North)
Dong	Dowdall	Saini	Sajjan
Dreeschen	Drouin	Saks	Samson
Dubourg	Duclos	Sangha	Sarai
Duguid	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Saroya	Scarpaleggia
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz	Scheer	Schieffe
Easter	Ehsassi	Schmale	Schulte
El-Khoury	Ellis	Serré	Sgro
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Shanahan	Sheehan
Falk (Provencher)	Fast	Shields	Shin
Fergus	Fillmore	ShIPLEY	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Findlay	Finnigan	Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simms
Fisher	Fonseca	Sloan	Sorbara
Fortier	Fragiskatos	Soroka	Spengemann
Fraser	Freeland	Stanton	Steinley
Fry	Gallant	Strahl	Stubbs
Garneau	Généreux	Sweet	Tabbara
Genius	Gerretsen	Tassi	Tochor
Gladu	Godin	Trudeau	Turnbull
Gould	Gourde	Uppal	Van Bynen
Gray	Guilbeault	van Koevorden	Van Popta
Hajdu	Hallan	Vandal	Vandenbeld
Harder	Hardie	Vaughan	Vecchio
Hoback	Holland	Vidal	Viersen
Housefather	Hussen	Virani	Vis
Hutchings	Iacono	Wagantall	Warkentin
Ien	Jaczek	WauGH	Webber
Jansen	Joly	Weiler	Wilkinson
Jones	Jordan	Williamson	Wilson-Raybould
Jowhari	Kelloway	Wong	Yip
Kelly	Kent	Young	Zahid
Khalid	Khera	Zann	Zimmer
Kitchen	KmieC	Zuberi— 269	
Koutrakis	Kram		
Kurek	Kusie		
Kusmierczyk	Lake		
Lalonde	Lambropoulos		
Lametti	Lamoureux		
Lattanzio	Lauzon		
Lawrence	LeBlanc		
Lebouthillier	Lefebvre		
Lehoux	Lewis (Essex)		
Liepert	Lightbound		
Lloyd	Lobb		
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)		

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 8 defeated.

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 13.

[English]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it, you will find unanimous consent to apply the results from the previous vote to this one, with Liberal members voting no.

• (2325)

[Translation]

Mr. Blake Richards: Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply the vote, and the Conservative members will be voting against the motion.

Mr. Martin Champoux: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour of the motion.

[English]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply and will be voting yea.

Ms. Yasmin Ratansi: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and I will be voting no.

Mr. Marwan Tabbara: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting no.

Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting no.

Mr. Paul Manly: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply and will be voting yes.

Mr. Derek Sloan: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting no.

Mr. Ramesh Sangha: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and I will be voting no.

(The House divided on Motion No. 13, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 170)

YEAS

Members

Angus	Ashton
Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Bergeron	Bérubé
Blaikie	Blanchet
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boudrias	Boulerice
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Chabot	Champoux
Charbonneau	DeBellefeuille
Desbiens	Desilets
Duvall	Fortin
Garrison	Gaudreau
Gill	Harris
Hughes	Johns
Julian	Larouche
Lemire	MacGregor
Manly	Masse
Mathysen	McPherson
Michaud	Normandin
Pauzé	Perron
Plamondon	Qaqqaq
Savard-Tremblay	Simard
Ste-Marie	Thériault
Therrien	Trudel
Vignola — 49	

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Aboutaif	Aitchison
Albas	Alghabra
Alleslev	Allison
Anand	Anandasangaree
Arnold	Arseneault
Arya	Atwin
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baker
Baldinelli	Barlow
Barrett	Battiste
Beech	Bendayan
Bennett	Benzen
Bergen	Berthold
Bessette	Bezan
Bibeau	Bittle
Blair	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Block	Blois
Bragdon	Brassard
Bratina	Brière
Calkins	Carr
Carrie	Casey
Chagger	Champagne
Chen	Chiu
Chong	Cooper
Cormier	Cumming
Dabrusin	Dalton
Dancho	Davidson
Deltell	d'Entremont
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diotte	Doherty
Dong	Dowdall
Dreeshen	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz
Easter	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Fergus	Fillmore
Findlay	Finnigan
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Gallant
Garneau	Généreux
Genius	Gerretsen
Gladu	Godin
Gould	Gourde
Gray	Guilbeault
Hajdu	Hallan
Harder	Hardie
Hoback	Holland
Housefather	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Ien	Jaczek
Jansen	Joly
Jones	Jordan
Jowhari	Kelloway
Kelly	Kent
Khalid	Khera
Kitchen	Kmiec
Koutrakis	Kram
Kurek	Kusie
Kusmierczyk	Lake
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lattanzio	Lauzon
Lawrence	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lefebvre

Government Orders

Lehoux	Lewis (Essex)
Liepert	Lightbound
Lloyd	Lobb
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
Lukiwski	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKenzie	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maguire	Maloney
Martel	Martinez Ferrada
May (Cambridge)	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McColeman
McCrimmon	McDonald
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McLean
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Melillo	Mendès
Mendicino	Miller
Monsef	Moore
Morantz	Morrison
Morrissey	Motz
Murray	Nater
Ng	O'Connell
Oliphant	O'Regan
O'Toole	Patzer
Paul-Hus	Petitpas Taylor
Poillievre	Powlowski
Qualtrough	Ratansi
Rayes	Redekopp
Regan	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Rood	Ruff
Sahota (Calgary Skyview)	Sahota (Brampton North)
Saini	Sajjan
Saks	Samson
Sangha	Sarai
Saroya	Scarpaleggia
Scheer	Schiefke
Schmale	Schulte
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Shields	Shin
Shiplay	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simms
Sloan	Sorbara
Soroka	Spengemann
Stanton	Steinley
Strahl	Stubbs
Sweet	Tabbara
Tassi	Tochor
Trudeau	Turnbull
Uppal	Van Bynen
van Koeverden	Van Popta
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Vecchio
Vidal	Viersen
Virani	Vis
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Weiler	Wilkinson
Williamson	Wilson-Raybould
Wong	Yip
Young	Zahid
Zann	Zimmer
Zuberi— 269	

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 13 defeated.

[Translation]

The question is on Motion No. 18.

[English]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, the Liberals agree to apply the vote and vote yes.**Mr. Blake Richards:** Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives agree to apply the vote and vote against.

[Translation]

Mr. Martin Champoux: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the results of the vote, and we will vote in favour.

[English]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agree to apply and will be voting yes.**Ms. Yasmin Ratansi:** Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting yes.**Mr. Marwan Tabbara:** Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting yes.**Mr. Paul Manly:** Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply and will be voting yes.**Mr. Derek Sloan:** Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting no.**Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould:** Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting no.**Mr. Ramesh Sangha:** Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting yes.

(The House divided on Motion No. 18, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 171)

YEAS

Members

Alhabra	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baker
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bendayan	Bennett
Bergeron	Bérubé
Bessette	Bibeau
Bittle	Blaikie
Blair	Blanchet
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Blois	Boudrias
Boulerice	Bratina
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe
Cannings	Carr
Casey	Chabot
Chagger	Champagne
Champoux	Charbonneau
Chen	Cormier
Dabrusin	DeBellefeuille
Desbiens	Desilets
Dhaliwal	Dhillon

Government Orders

Dong	Drouin	Young	Zahid
Dubourg	Duclos	Zann	Zuberi— 200
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)		
Duvall	Dzerowicz		NAYS
Easter	Ehsassi		Members
El-Khoury	Ellis		Aitchison
Fergus	Fillmore	Aboultaif	Alleslev
Finnigan	Fisher	Albas	Arnold
Fonseca	Fortier	Allison	Barlow
Fortin	Fragiskatos	Baldinelli	Benzen
Fraser	Freeland	Barrett	Berthold
Fry	Garneau	Bergen	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Garrison	Gaudreau	Bezan	Bragdon
Gerretsen	Gill	Block	Calkins
Gould	Guilbeault	Brassard	Chiu
Hajdu	Hardie	Carrie	Cooper
Harris	Holland	Chong	Dalton
Housefather	Hughes	Cumming	Davidson
Hussen	Hutchings	Dancho	d'Entremont
Iacono	Ien	Deltell	Doherty
Jaczek	Johns	Diotte	Dreeshen
Joly	Jones	Dowdall	Epp
Jordan	Jowhari	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Falk (Provencher)
Julian	Kelloway	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Findlay
Khalid	Khera	Fast	Généreux
Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk	Gallant	Gladu
Lalonde	Lambropoulos	Genuis	Gourde
Lametti	Lamoureux	Godin	Hallan
Larouche	Lattanzio	Gray	Hoback
Lauzon	LeBlanc	Harder	Kelly
Lebouthillier	Lefebvre	Jansen	Kitchen
Lemire	Lightbound	Kent	Kram
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	Kmiec	Kusie
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacGregor	Kurek	Lawrence
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney	Lake	Lewis (Essex)
Manly	Martinez Ferrada	Lehoux	Lloyd
Masse	Mathysen	Liepert	Lukiwski
May (Cambridge)	McCrimmon	Lobb	Maguire
McDonald	McGuinty	MacKenzie	Mazier
McKay	McKenna	Martel	McColeman
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	McPherson	McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Mendès	Medicino	McLean	Moore
Michaud	Miller	Melillo	Morrison
Monsef	Morrissey	Morantz	Nater
Murray	Ng	Motz	Patzer
Normandin	O'Connell	O'Toole	Poilievre
Oliphant	O'Regan	Paul-Hus	Redekopp
Pauzé	Perron	Rayes	Rempel Garner
Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon	Reid	Rood
Powlowski	Qaqqaq	Richards	Sahota (Calgary Skyview)
Qualtrough	Ratansi	Ruff	Scheer
Regan	Robillard	Saroya	Shields
Rodriguez	Rogers	Schmale	Shiple
Romanado	Sahota (Brampton North)	Shin	Soroka
Saini	Sajjan	Sloan	Stanton
Saks	Samson	Stanton	Strahl
Sangha	Sarai	Strahl	Sweet
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia	Sweet	Uppal
Schiefke	Schulte	Uppal	Vecchio
Serré	Sgro	Vecchio	Viersen
Shanahan	Sheehan	Viersen	Wagantall
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)	Wagantall	Webber
Simard	Simms	Waugh	Wilson-Raybould
Sorbara	Spengemann	Williamson	Zimmer— 118
Ste-Marie	Tabbara	Wong	
Tassi	Thériault		
Therrien	Trudeau		
Trudel	Turnbull		
Van Bynen	van Koeverden		
Vandal	Vandenbeld		
Vaughan	Vignola		
Virani	Weiler		
Wilkinson	Yip		

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 18 carried.

Government Orders

[Translation]

The question is on Motion No. 22.

[English]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, the Liberals agree to apply and will be voting no.

Mr. Blake Richards: Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives agree to apply and will be voting in support.

[Translation]

Mr. Martin Champoux: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the results of the vote, and we will indubitably vote in favour.

[English]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agree to apply and, along with our leader, the member for Burnaby South, will be voting yes.

Ms. Yasmin Ratansi: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting no.

• (2330)

Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting no.

Mr. Paul Manly: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply and will be voting yes.

Mr. Derek Sloan: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting yes.

Mr. Marwan Tabbara: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting no.

[Translation]

(The House divided on Motion No. 22, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 172)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Alleslev
Allison	Angus
Arnold	Ashton
Baldinelli	Barlow
Barrett	Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu	Benzen
Bergen	Bergeron
Berthold	Bérubé
Bezan	Blaikie
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Block	Boudrias
Boulerice	Bragdon
Brassard	Brunelle-Duceppe
Calkins	Cannings
Carrie	Chabot
Champoux	Charbonneau
Chiu	Chong
Cooper	Cumming
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	DeBellefeuille
Deltell	d'Entremont
Desbiens	Desilets
Diotte	Doherty

Dowdall	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Duvall
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Findlay	Fortin
Gallant	Garrison
Gaudreau	Généreux
Genuis	Gill
Glalu	Godin
Gourde	Gray
Hallan	Harder
Harris	Hoback
Hughes	Jansen
Johns	Julian
Kelly	Kent
Kitchen	Kmiec
Kram	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Larouche	Lawrence
Lehoux	Lemire
Lewis (Essex)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Lukiwski	MacGregor
MacKenzie	Maguire
Manly	Martel
Masse	Mathysen
Mazier	McCaulley (Edmonton West)
McColeman	McLean
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	McPherson
Melillo	Michaud
Moore	Morantz
Morrison	Motz
Nater	Normandin
O'Toole	Patzer
Paul-Hus	Pauzé
Perron	Plamondon
Poilievre	Qaqqaq
Rayes	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Rood
Ruff	Sahota (Calgary Skyview)
Saroya	Savard-Tremblay
Scheer	Schmale
Shields	Shin
Shiple	Simard
Singh	Sloan
Soroka	Stanton
Steinley	Ste-Marie
Strahl	Stubbs
Sweet	Thériault
Therrien	Tochor
Trudel	Uppal
Van Popta	Vecchio
Vidal	Viersen
Vignola	Vis
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Williamson	Wong
Zimmer— 167	

NAYS

Members

Alghabra	Anand
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Atwin
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baker
Battiste	Beech
Bendayan	Bennett
Besette	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Blois	Bratina

Government Orders

Brière	Carr
Casey	Chagger
Champagne	Chen
Cormier	Dabrusin
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Dong	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Fergus
Fillmore	Finnigan
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Garneau
Gerretsen	Gould
Guilbeault	Hajdu
Hardie	Holland
Housefather	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Ien	Jaczek
Joly	Jones
Jordan	Jowhari
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lattanzio
Lauzon	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lefebvre
Lightbound	Longfield
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Martinez Ferrada	May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon	McDonald
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendès	Mendicino
Miller	Monsef
Morrissey	Murray
Ng	O'Connell
Olipphant	O'Regan
Petitpas Taylor	Powlowski
Qualtrough	Ratansi
Regan	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Sahota (Brampton North)
Saini	Sajjan
Saks	Samson
Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Schulte
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms	Sorbara
Spengemann	Tabbara
Tassi	Trudeau
Turnbull	Van Bynen
van Koeverden	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Virani	Weiler
Wilkinson	Wilson-Raybould
Yip	Young
Zahid	Zann
Zuberi— 151	

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 22 carried.

[English]

Hon. Steven Guilbeault moved:

That Bill C-10, an act to amend the Broadcasting Act and to make related and consequential amendments to other acts, as amended, be concurred in at report stage with further amendments.

[Translation]

The Speaker: If a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes to request a recorded division or that the motion be adopted on division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[English]

Mr. Blake Richards: Mr. Speaker, I request a recorded division.

● (2340)

[Translation]

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 173)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Atwin	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Baker	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Bendayan
Bennett	Bergeron
Bérubé	Besette
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Blois
Boudrias	Boulerice
Bratina	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Champagne	Champoux
Charbonneau	Chen
Cormier	Dabrusin
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Desilets	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Dong
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Duval
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Fergus
Fillmore	Finnigan
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Garneau	Garrison
Gaudreau	Gerretsen
Gill	Gould
Guilbeault	Hajdu
Hardie	Harris
Holland	Housefather
Hughes	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Ien	Jaczek

Government Orders

Johns	Joly	Davidson	Deltell
Jones	Jordan	d'Entremont	Diotte
Jowhari	Julian	Doherty	Dowdall
Kelloway	Khalid	Dreeshen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Khera	Koutrakis	Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Kusmierczyk	Lalonde	Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Lambropoulos	Lametti	Findlay	Gallant
Lamoureux	Larouche	Généreux	Genuis
Lattanzio	Lauzon	Gladi	Godin
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier	Gourde	Gray
Lefebvre	Lemire	Hallan	Harder
Lightbound	Long	Hoback	Jansen
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	Kelly	Kent
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacGregor	Kitchen	Kmiec
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney	Kram	Kurek
Manly	Marcil	Kusie	Lake
Martinez Ferrada	Masse	Lawrence	Lehoux
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)	Lewis (Essex)	Liepert
McCrimmon	McDonald	Lloyd	Lobb
McGuinty	McKay	Lukiwski	MacKenzie
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	Maguire	Martel
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	McPherson	Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
Mendès	Mendicino	McColeman	McLean
Michaud	Miller	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Melillo
Monsef	Morrissey	Moore	Morantz
Murray	Ng	Morrison	Motz
Normandin	O'Connell	Nater	O'Toole
Oliphant	O'Regan	Pamondon	Paul-Hus
Pauzé	Perron	Patzner	Rayes
Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon	Poilievre	Reid
Powlowski	Qaqqaq	Redekopp	Richards
Qualtrough	Ratansi	Rempel Garner	Ruff
Regan	Robillard	Rood	Saroya
Rodriguez	Rogers	Sahota (Calgary Skyview)	Schmale
Romanado	Sahota (Brampton North)	Scheer	Shin
Saini	Sajjan	Shields	Sloan
Saks	Samson	Shiple	Stanton
Sangha	Sarai	Soroka	Strahl
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia	Steinley	Sweet
Schiefke	Schulte	Stubbs	Uppal
Serré	Sgro	Tochor	Vecchio
Shanahan	Sheehan	Van Popta	Viersen
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)	Vidal	Wagantall
Simard	Simms	Vis	Waugh
Singh	Sorbara	Warkentin	Williamson
Spengemann	Ste-Marie	Webber	Wong
Tabbara	Tassi	Wilson-Raybould	Zimmer— 118
Thériault	Therrien	Yurdiga	
Trudeau	Trudel		
Turnbull	Van Bynen		
van Koeverden	Vandal		
Vandenbeld	Vaughan		
Vignola	Virani		
Weiler	Wilkinson		
Yip	Young		
Zahid	Zann		
Zuberi— 203			

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Pursuant to order made earlier today, the House will now proceed to the third reading stage of this bill.

● (2345)

[*English*]

Hon. Steven Guilbeault moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

[*Translation*]

The Speaker: Pursuant to an order made earlier today, a member of each recognized party and a member of the Green Party will each be allowed to speak for not more than 10 minutes followed by five minutes for questions and comments.

NAYS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Alleslev
Allison	Arnold
Baldinelli	Barlow
Barrett	Benzen
Bergen	Berthold
Bezan	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Block	Brassard
Calkins	Carrie
Chiu	Chong
Cooper	Cumming
Dalton	Dancho

[English]

Ms. Julie Dabrusin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the third reading of Bill C-10, a bill that would modernize the Broadcasting Act. This bill fulfills our government's promise to artists and creators, and will make Canada's broadcasting system more inclusive, accessible and equitable for all Canadians.

The Broadcasting Act has not been updated for 30 years. During that time, foreign web giants have stepped into the void. They have made money in Canada without contributing to our cultural creative industries. Bill C-10 seeks to modernize our broadcasting system and to level the playing field between our traditional broadcasters and these foreign web giants.

A modernized Broadcasting Act is urgently needed. It puts in place the right framework to support Canadian creators, producers and broadcasters to maintain the vitality of Canadian content creation and diversity of voices in the creative industry at large. It ensures that foreign web giants and streaming services contribute fairly to the Canadian broadcasting system, like our domestic broadcasters have for decades, and strives for fairness in the new digital world.

Even before tabling the bill, we heard from people who worked across the entire spectrum of the broadcasting sector about the importance of modernization. In June 2018, our government appointed a panel to review the broadcasting and telecommunications legislative framework. We received over 2,000 written submissions and heard directly from many people through conferences across the country. The Yale Report was released in January 2020, making recommendations based on this intensive study that created the framework for Bill C-10 and the modernization of the Broadcasting Act.

I want to underline this point. The consultations leading to this bill includes the work done by that esteemed panel that produced this report. Even before second reading, the heritage committee agreed to a pre-study and it ultimately took on the study of this bill. There were suggestions that we heard from people working in the industry as to how the bill could be improved. We have listened to these concerns and we took action.

Government and opposition parties proposed amendments. In many cases, more than one party proposed pretty much the same amendments, which were moments when there was better collaboration as we worked through them. In other moments, we had very heated debate and ultimately a Conservative filibuster, which kept members from being able to discuss improvements that could be made. Ultimately, the parties were able to work through the stack of amendments we had before us and to present an amended bill to the House.

Bill C-10 would level the playing field, supporting community broadcasting, inclusion and diversity and providing the CRTC with the proper tools to fulfill this modernization. The modernization includes bringing social media companies, and not their users, into the framework. This is because social media companies, for example, YouTube, have become major distributors for music in our country.

Government Orders

Users uploading content to social media are specifically excluded and the CRTC powers over social media companies themselves are restricted to only the following: first, request information from social media companies about the revenues they earn in Canada; second, require that they contribute a percentage of those revenues to cultural production funds; and third, make our Canadian creators discoverable on their platforms. I will break that down.

The first is to request information from social media companies about the revenues that they earn in Canada. Right now, we do not even know how much revenue these platforms such as YouTube generate in Canada. This seems like a reasonable step to take. I cannot see why the opposition parties, such as the Conservatives, want to let foreign platforms continue to operate in Canada without having to disclose this information. This is money made by foreign companies right in Canada.

The second requires that social media companies contribute a percentage of their revenues made in Canada to our cultural production funds. This goes to the core of supporting our artists. Broadcasters and radio pay into Factor or Musicaction to support our artists under the traditional system. It is time for these web giants, which have been getting richer during the pandemic, to pay into these funds as well.

The third is to make our Canadian creators more discoverable on their platforms. I would like to clarify on this point that the discoverability requirement is not the same as the one that applies to traditional TV and radio broadcasters. Social media companies do not need to show or play a proportion of Canadian shows or music. The discoverability requirement for social media companies is only to make our creators discoverable. This simply means to include them as suggestions in playlists, for example, or something of that type.

● (2350)

I would like to make one more point on the CRTC's restricted powers regarding social media companies. The CRTC will not have any powers relating to broadcasting standards that could be imposed on social media. Its only powers for social media companies are the three I have listed.

In debate at committee and in this place, there has been much that was raised about freedom of expression, and I want to address this point. The Broadcasting Act includes a specific clause that it must be interpreted in a way that respects freedom of expression and journalistic and creative independence. That has been there for the past 30 years.

Government Orders

At committee, we added a further clause that repeats this protection specifically for social media companies. The charter statement and amendment analysis from justice confirms that Bill C-10 does not impinge on freedom of expression. Bill C-10 levels the playing field and requires web giants to contribute to Canadian shows and music. It does not infringe freedom of expression.

[*Translation*]

Today, we are discussing a bill that will improve the representation of all Canadians in the programs that they watch. When most of the programming available to Canadians does not reflect their actual lived experiences, something needs to change.

That is why Bill C-10 makes advances to ensure that the Broadcasting Act promotes greater diversity. Programming that represents indigenous people, ethnocultural minorities, racialized communities, and francophones and anglophones, including those who belong to official language minority communities, the LGBTQ+ community and people with disabilities will no longer only be provided as resources become available. The offer and availability of such programming is essential for self-actualization.

The policies set out in the Broadcasting Act will ensure that our broadcasting system reflects Canadian society and that diverse and inclusive programming is available to everyone. That is essential so that the Canadian broadcasting system can help broaden people's perspectives, spur empathy and compassion for others and celebrate our differences, while strengthening the common bonds that unite our unique Canadian society.

[*English*]

Many of these aspects of broadcasting that have been simply migrated online have happened, and we need to bring them into the Canadian fold. It does not cover the whole of the Internet, as some might say. Bill C-10 includes clear authority for the CRTC to exempt certain classes of undertakings from regulation and to avoid regulation where such an imposition would not contribute in a material manner to the implementation of the broadcasting policy objectives.

Much debate has occurred about social media. Social media has clearly become an important tool for self-expression for Canadians. The bill would not interfere with the lawful use of this medium to express one's self.

The Conservatives stated that they would oppose this modernization of the Broadcasting Act even before changes were made at committee. While they raised issues about freedom of expression, which I addressed earlier, it seems like the objection from the start, and to this time, was about something else. A member of the Conservative caucus called artists who received support “niche groups”, that all of them must be stuck in the early 1990s because they had not managed to be competitive on new platforms and were producing material that Canadians just did not want.

I wonder if the member for the Conservative opposition was referring to shows from Alberta, such as *Heartland*, or *Little Mosque on the Prairie*, or maybe successful Canadian shows like *Murdoch Mysteries*, *Kim's Convenience*, *Corner Gas*, or Canadian musicians like Jessie Reyez, Gord Downie and the Arkells, all of whom received support through our cultural production funds.

Our government has crafted a carefully considered bill, and Bill C-10 would ensure our distinctively Canadian stories continue into the future.

● (2355)

Mr. Damien Kurek (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): Madam Speaker, I find it troubling that we are being forced into closure, once again, on a debate that many have raised the concerns of censorship. It seems that the government is more worried about Conservative opposition to this than actually fixing what is deeply flawed legislation.

The minister has said that all artists support the legislation, and that is patently false. I have heard from some in my constituency and others across the country as well as those who I know have reached out to the minister directly, saying that they have concerns.

I am wondering if the member is willing to correct the record and acknowledge that there is not universal agreement from artistic communities on Bill C-10.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Madam Speaker, I find that to be an interesting question, because it goes again to the heart of where I ended when I was speaking about the position that had been taken by the member for Lethbridge about artists who were stuck in the nineties. In fact, we are hearing from artists across the country in support of the modernization of the Broadcasting Act. I mentioned that even the Yale report had heard over 2,000 submissions. However, just recently, artists such as Jean Yoon from *Kim's Convenience* have spoken in favour as have Yannick Bisson, and Lorne Cardinal from *Corner Gas*. Many artists who we respect and deeply love as Canadians have shown their support and we will be there to support them.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Madam Speaker, I thank the parliamentary secretary for her brief speech. I was astonished to hear her repeat that we still do not know how much operating revenue web giants earn in Canada or Quebec. The Liberals have been in power for six years, and I see this as an admission of failure on their part.

Bill C-10 is generally speaking a good idea. However, the other failure is the Liberals' poor management of the legislative agenda. Even invoking closure at committee, which has only happened three times in Canada's history, was not enough to get this bill passed. We needed this evening's supermotion to get the job done, or at least I hope we will. Did the Liberals take this issue lightly, even though it is so important for our cultural sovereignty?

Government Orders

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Mr. Speaker, we have never taken this issue lightly. Moreover, it was rather sad that the NDP chose not to support us when the government asked for more committee meetings in the spring. We could have taken the time a bit earlier, as we had asked.

We worked extremely hard, as the member opposite knows full well. The Conservatives filibustered, and that led to delays, but we worked hard, and we are still working hard. We know that artists are waiting for us to get this done, and I am very happy that we are very close to achieving the goal here in the House.

[*English*]

Mr. Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this evening, the Canada research chair in Internet and e-commerce law stated that he found it hard to think of a bill that had been more poorly communicated or understood. He specifically called out the Liberal government for misleading Canadians about the impact it would have on social media services.

Would the member simply believe that the Canada research chair is wrong or is in fact the government impacting social media users?

• (2400)

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity, if it has not been clear, to make it even clearer. Proposed subsection 2(2.1) specifically excludes content uploaded by users. There are protections built into the Broadcasting Act for freedom of expression that have been added for social media companies, and there is as an additional protection. I have been very clear that the CRTC has only three powers over social media companies: to require the reporting of revenues, to require that a portion of Canadian revenues be contributed to Canadian funds and to ensure that Canadian creators are discoverable. It is very clear, very short and very simple.

Mr. Kerry Diotte (Edmonton Griesbach, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Toronto's CN Tower is a Canadian landmark that is known worldwide. When it was completed in 1976, it was the highest free-standing structure in the world. It is 553 metres tall, or about 1,800 old-fashioned feet high. That is the length of five and a half football fields. It has actually been named a wonder of the modern world, right up there with the Golden Gate Bridge and the Empire State Building. The CN Tower gets a lot of attention, and tons of people visit it: two million a year.

Some of those visitors got more than they bargained for on July 16, 2001. On that day, two radical activists decided to do a dangerous illegal stunt. The two men scaled the outside of the tower and unfurled a banner. That banner bashed the Liberal government and the U.S. government for allegedly being killers of the planet. Not doing enough to fight climate change was the charge. The men had to be rescued by firefighters, and they were later charged and convicted for their dangerous stunt. The court heard that the whole ordeal cost CN \$50,000, but the two men only had to pay \$3,000 in fines in total. I guess the punishment did not quite fit the crime.

Who were those two men who created such havoc and made headlines worldwide? They were both Greenpeace activists. One was a British guy, Chris Holden. The other fella has really climbed to new heights. He is now a Liberal cabinet minister, the heritage minister. Two decades after his last dangerous stunt, this radical

guy is pulling another one. In some ways, it is even more dangerous than his first stunt. He wants to censor our online free speech.

By now many Canadians have heard of Bill C-10. It is actually interesting that hundreds of bills are discussed in the House and most people do not pay attention. If we mentioned a random bill, the average Canadian likely would not know what it is about and probably would not care. We realize that a bill is controversial when regular folks know about it and know it by name and number. I did a virtual meeting with students from a grade 6 class a couple of weeks back and they knew about Bill C-10. They were very concerned about it. They should be.

I have a special interest myself in Bill C-10. I worked as a journalist for three decades in radio, TV, newspapers and news magazines, so free speech is in my DNA. For many years I was an opinion columnist for the Toronto Sun chain. Opinion columnists at Sun Media were the lifeblood of that organization. Every survey we did showed that many people bought the newspapers, and sometimes just to read one of the regular columnists.

I am not going to bore anybody by dissecting the intricate legalese of Bill C-10. Lots of lawyers and legal experts have argued the finer points in detail. I know the government will tout this bill as being all about supporting Canadian content. It has already done that. It claims it is not out to stop free speech in any real way, but I do not believe it. Most Canadians do not either. It is no wonder that we do not believe it. The government has earned a reputation, and it is not a good reputation. It cannot be trusted. I do not trust it and Canadians do not trust it.

The Prime Minister and his Liberals have a long string of botched files, ethics violations, broken promises and cover-ups. They failed to quickly close our borders when COVID hit. Then they failed on quickly getting Canadians vaccines. They tried to do a deal with the communist Chinese regime to get vaccines. Of course that failed miserably.

The Liberals have failed on many, many fronts: the SNC-Lavalin affair, the WE scandal, cash for access, cancelled energy projects, disgraced cabinet ministers and MPs, blackface, the trip to the Aga Khan's private island, no serious plan to open our international border and cover-ups galore. Let us consider a recent one. It is about the Winnipeg National Microbiology Lab and a refusal to provide vital documents to a key parliamentary committee. Look for that to be in the headlines for a long time.

Government Orders

Is it any wonder that Canadians do not trust the Liberals? Is it any wonder they cannot be trusted with something so sacred as free speech? Is it any wonder that people do not trust the minister proposing Bill C-10, a guy with a radical past, a guy who got hauled off in handcuffs and was convicted by a court of law?

• (2405)

We have already seen censorship raise its ugly head on the Internet. It is already happening at an alarming rate. I bet every Canadian with a computer knows someone who has had a social media post flagged or deleted by big tech. It could have been for something as simple as a personal opinion about COVID rules. I bet many of us know people whose social media accounts have been suspended or even shut down by big tech. It is ridiculous that some self-appointed 20-something is a judge at a big tech firm like Twitter, Facebook or YouTube.

It also seems like conservative voices are the ones often targeted by these censors. It is strange how that works. Can members imagine what kind of censorship will happen if the Liberal government controls our online speech? I shudder to think of it.

Some people might say that since I am a member of the official opposition, of course I will slam any Liberal bill. Well, it is not just the official opposition. There are a lot of people against this Big Brother bill. Every constituent I talk to wants me to fight against the bill. I cannot recall one person coming to me to say, "Hey, Kerry, you have to support Bill C-10." In fact, I have heard so much opposition to the bill that I decided to start an online petition against it. I was inundated with people signing it. I told them that I would send a letter of protest directly to the Prime Minister on their behalf, and that is exactly what I did.

Speaking of opposition to Bill C-10, members should check out what Tim Denton said. He is a former national CRTC commissioner, and he is also the current chair of the Internet Society Canada Chapter. Mr. Denton had this to say:

C-10 is clearly intended to allow speech control at the government's discretion. Ignore the turn signals, look at where the wheels are pointed. They are pointed at your right to communicate freely by means of the internet.

This is scary stuff. Who would members trust to pass judgment on this bill, our heritage minister, with his radical past, or Mr. Denton? I know who I would trust.

How about the comment from Peter Menzies? He is a long-time journalist and former CRTC vice-chair. I worked in journalism with Peter. He is a good guy, a smart guy. He has summed up the Liberal bill really well. He said that Bill C-10 "will place the internet under the control of the...CRTC. Its nine unelected, unaccountable commissioners will decide if your Facebook post or YouTube video is appropriate internet content." My former colleague goes on to point out that the heritage minister "has promised more legislation to establish another regulatory panel to oversee what sort of things people may say on social media. All of this constitutes an outrageous abuse of government authority."

We can see where this legislation could go. Maybe a person does not like a government program or a policy or a politician and speaks out. Maybe they will get blocked or cancelled. There is a lot

of cancel culture out there to go around, and the legislation before us would only make things worse.

The bottom line is that the Liberal government cannot be trusted with our free speech. The minister, with his radical, checkered past, cannot be trusted with our free speech. Our free speech is too sacred to be imperiled by this terrible, dangerous legislation. Canadians are saying that loud and clear. Bill C-10 must be defeated. Our very democracy in Canada is at stake.

• (2410)

Ms. Lenore Zann (Cumberland—Colchester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I guess we have just heard the platform speech for the next election. While I admire the member's voice and can see that he has training and background in delivery, I have to ask what he has against Canadian performers being paid properly for their work online?

Mr. Kerry Diotte: Mr. Speaker, that is the old divert-the-eye trick. It is like a slight of hand. It is not about Canadian performers. I know many of them, and some of my best friends are performers. It is about freedom of speech.

The government and the Liberals keep going back to try to shame us, but this is about freedom of speech. It is not about anything else. If members talked to any average Canadian at a Tim Hortons, now that we are open in good old Alberta, they will say they do not like this bill.

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I did notice the member spoke almost not at all about the bill, which is interesting because that is why we are here. Since I am sure he has read the bill and has read the act, he knows there are numerous places in both the act and the bill where freedom of expression is explicitly protected.

While the Liberals may not be trustworthy, members will recall that the Bloc, the Green Party and the NDP also support this legislation. New Democrats have always stood up for freedom of expression. They have a long history of that, and they have always stood up for net neutrality. The only party that is against this legislation is the Conservative Party.

I have heard from one Conservative MP that he has raised over \$3,000 by fearmongering around Bill C-10 in his riding. Would the member share how much money he has raised in his riding by fearmongering on Bill C-10?

Mr. Kerry Diotte: Mr. Speaker, that is another diversionary tactic because the NDP member does not understand the kernel of this. As I said, I am not going to dissect this bill; I am not a lawyer.

Government Orders

However, I know one thing. I know about freedom of expression. I was a journalist for 30 years. I talk to a lot of people, and I represent my constituents, who are telling me that they do not like this legislation and they do not trust the Liberals. The Liberals have not earned the trust on this bill. It is as simple as that. That is the absolute truth.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I listened to my colleague's speech, and I must say that it was shockingly chock full of fearmongering. I have seldom heard anything like that. On top of that, these words are from a former journalist. He himself said that he had been a journalist for 30 years.

I remind my colleagues that facts are important in journalism. They have clearly chosen party lines over the facts in this debate.

My colleague mentioned a few times that he was interested in Bill C-10 and that he was fairly familiar with it. My colleague from Edmonton Strathcona said that there are numerous places in Bill C-10 and in the act where freedom of expression is explicitly protected.

Could my colleague explain exactly which clauses in Bill C-10 could potentially undermine freedom of expression? What are the specific sections he is referring to?

• (2415)

[*English*]

Mr. Kerry Diotte: Mr. Speaker, that is another diversionary tactic. I very clearly stated in my speech that I was not going to dissect it. I am not a lawyer.

It comes down to trust. People do not trust the government on this issue of free speech, nor has the government earned that trust. We just have to talk to many people. I have seldom seen a groundswell against a bill like the one I have seen with this bill.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we have finally reached the end of this bill on which many people have worked very hard in the past few months. I commend the members of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage who have been working hard since Bill C-10 was introduced.

As we have said many times, this bill was not perfect when it was introduced. I used a metaphor, comparing this bill to a brand new paint by numbers. We had a lot of work to do.

The way it works is that we all vote in favour of a bill and agree to send it to committee. The House of Commons speaks and democracy does its job. At that point, it is our responsibility to work on improving the bills that are introduced and that must be studied in committee, and we made the decision to work on this bill, even though the task was, quite frankly, monumental.

We decided to do this work even if the task was altogether daunting. We committed to do it and we did. It was going relatively well until the withdrawal of clause 4.1 gave the Conservatives the opportunity they had been waiting for. It was the perfect opportunity to speak out against a possible attack on freedom of expression.

The support of various experts who already did not have a very high opinion of this bill, which obviously had an impact on web giants, was all it took for the Conservatives to come down on Bill C-10 like a ton of bricks by pointing out all of the problems with the bill and demonizing it as much as possible.

I am rather pleased that we are in the final stages of this bill, particularly because we have pretty much covered all of the arguments and the list of witnesses and experts on which the Conservatives based their fearmongering.

My colleagues have said this repeatedly, and I will reiterate that the Broadcasting Act and Bill C-10 contain several provisions that specifically exempt social media users, regular people like us and the people we care about, from the Broadcasting Act regulations.

The provisions in Bill C-10 apply only to broadcasting undertakings. However, if entities that use social media sites like YouTube also engage in broadcasting, we have to regulate those broadcasting activities.

That excludes the activities of users who share content and little videos with each other or who have somewhat more organized channels that might even earn them an income. This does not apply to those people, as specifically stated in Bill C-10.

The campaign of fear has run its course. It has slowed the progress of this extremely important bill since April, with what is commonly known as organized filibustering. Who will pay for that? The artists, creators, culture and the cultural community in Quebec, but also in Canada. The only ones to profit from it are the Conservatives, who oppose the bill, despite the fact that the other parties of the House are working hard to improve it and move it forward. I remind members that this bill was imperfect, but certainly not as bad as what the Conservatives have been saying for weeks and weeks.

There is another principle that I would like to revisit. I am reminded of the mother who watches a military parade go by and notices that one soldier is walking in the opposite direction, against the parade. Upon realizing that the soldier in question is her son, she wonders why everyone else is marching in the wrong direction. That is kind of what this reminds me of.

Sooner or later, when someone realizes that they are the only one who thinks something and nobody else thinks what they think, they might consider a little open-mindedness. They might accept that they have expressed their point of view, that others disagree, that we are all working in a democratic system and that the majority is supposed to rule. They can tell themselves that they fought hard and that, even though they tried hard to defend their point of view, they now have to be a good sport and stop trying to sabotage things.

Government Orders

● (2420)

That is not what happened, however. This attitude prevailed to the very end. We saw the filibustering, at times very disgraceful, and we have reached a point where Bill C-10 may be in jeopardy. We will have to keep our fingers crossed. I intend to stay hopeful until the end, but I think this could have gone better. We could have done much more and been more noble in what we needed to accomplish. Again, it is our artists and culture that are at stake.

The web giants are earning billions of dollars on the backs of our creators. It is only fair to subject them to the same rules as broadcasters operating in Canada and Quebec.

How many times have the Bloc Québécois been criticized for throwing up their hands and supporting closure with the Liberals? It is awful. I must say that we had to swallow our pride since we are against the use of closure motions. Nonetheless, it is a parliamentary tool that exists. It is not perfect and it is certainly not noble, but neither is systematic filibustering.

Sometimes, the only way to respond to a questionable tactic is to employ another tactic that may also be considered questionable. It definitely is frustrating to come up against a gag order. We have been there as well. However, a bill for artists, for culture and for the industry deserves the right tools. If someone is standing in the way, we will use the procedural moves at our disposal.

The Conservatives will probably take the heat for a long time for scuttling the bill, if it were to fail. Quebec's motto, on all of its licence plates, is "Je me souviens", or "I remember". Quebec artists and those who have a lot of influence in the cultural sector will remember.

Culture does not cost anything. In an interview with a local paper in her riding, the member for Lethbridge said that Quebec artists were outdated, that they were stuck in the 1990s and that they were reliant on grants because they produce things people do not want. That is not true. Canada's cultural industry generates billions of dollars in economic spinoffs every year. The industry costs nothing; it brings in money. The industry is valuable, and not just in terms of money. We are talking about our identity here.

I will end my speech on a positive note. Just now, we voted for something positive.

Bill C-10 was not perfect, and the Bloc Québécois believed that it was important not to wait another 30 years to amend the Broadcasting Act.

This evening, we voted to include a sunset clause in the bill, which ensures that the act must be reviewed every five years. We live in a world that is evolving at an incredible pace. Where will technology be in five years? We have no idea.

It is very important to set a limit and to give ourselves shorter deadlines for a mandatory review of the Broadcasting Act. It should be reviewed more frequently than every 30 years. In my opinion, it is one of the best ideas that we have had. We will have the opportunity to review the bill every five years and to correct whatever flaws may remain in the legislation, if it is passed.

● (2425)

[*English*]

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the point my colleague is making about the importance of culture and the arts in Quebec. I would say that arts and culture are certainly important in all parts of the country and really to all people everywhere.

The problem is that the government has presented us with a framework that provides a false choice. It says that, in order to support artists, we would allow the government to intervene and regulate social media algorithms.

We would say that we do not have to choose between supporting artists and protecting freedom of speech. We could devise various other mechanisms by which we could provide support for artists, and also not have the CRTC intervening and regulating social media algorithms. We should get out of this false choice presented by the government, where we have to either support artists or protect freedom of speech. We can and should, in fact, do both.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Martin Champoux: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan for his question, and I want to say how much I appreciate his work on human rights. I am delighted that he is asking a question that elevates the debate somewhat, and I very much appreciate it.

The issue of algorithms is tricky, actually. There has been a lot of talk about it, and we learned a great deal from this study, but we are not asking to control the algorithms. What is really needed are ways to ensure that the regulations put in place by the CRTC are respected. If algorithms are part of that approach, such as programming, there must be a way to access the algorithms. However, there is absolutely no question of controlling them, and there never was.

I think there is indeed a way to protect arts and culture, and to ensure the discoverability of Canadian and Quebec content. If algorithms are a verification tool, I think they need to be accessible.

Mr. Tim Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am learning to speak French. It is important to me.

I know just how important Quebec culture is to Canada. How will Bill C-10 support artists and culture in Quebec and Canada?

Mr. Martin Champoux: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say what amazing progress my colleague from Kitchener—Conestoga has made in learning French, and I would like to take a moment to applaud his hard work. He is a member of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage, and every time we do a sound check, which is mandatory before committee meetings, he does his in French, which is his way of sharing what he has been learning. Bloc Québécois members really appreciate that kind of thing, and I really appreciate the fact that he asked his whole question in French. I congratulate my esteemed colleague.

Government Orders

The answer to his question is very simple. Bill C-10 is necessary because new players, digital players, which are colossal multinationals with massive resources, have to be subject to the Broadcasting Act, they have to contribute to Canada's broadcasting system, and they have to enable our artists, who are helping them get rich, to succeed on their platforms. That is why this bill is extremely important to our artists.

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Drummond for his speech, but also for all the work he has done in committee. I know his passion for defending Quebec artists and culture.

In his view, why is it that the Liberals have managed this file so badly? Why is it that we have reached June 21, after an unprecedented time allocation was imposed on a committee, and we have to debate this tonight? Does he not think the Liberals treated the issue of culture rather lightly?

Mr. Martin Champoux: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, and I want to return the compliment because I know how committed he is to culture. I think we have worked collaboratively and effectively together over the past few months.

I think we are past the point of throwing rocks and tomatoes and pointing fingers at one another. In the case of Bill C-10, the government probably had some difficulty in managing communications and perhaps also made some questionable decisions around managing priorities. There were several things along the way that we would have liked to see done very quickly, and many times we would have chosen different priorities. At this point, however, I think we should cross our fingers and hope that the bill goes through and sees the light of day. If not, we will have to roll up our sleeves, spit in our hands, as someone else has said, and start over.

● (2430)

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in the debate this evening on such an important issue.

I just complimented my colleague from Drummond, and I also have some kind words for my colleague from Edmonton Strathcona. She did a masterful job on Bill C-10 at the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage. Her assistant, Laveza Khan, also worked very hard on it, and my assistant Samuel Fortin-Pouliot worked very hard too. I commend everyone. They truly put in the work, as they say.

I agree that we absolutely needed to amend the Broadcasting Act. It has been 30 years since that act was passed. It had become completely archaic and obsolete, and it still is. It does not fit with today's reality and the current context with the new digital broadcasters. I think we need to keep that in mind when we debate this bill.

That is why the NDP has always worked and remained in touch with various actors and stakeholders in Quebec's cultural sector, in particular the Coalition for the Diversity of Cultural Expressions and also ACTRA, Unifor and Music Canada. They have always counted on us. We worked with them to try to improve this very important bill.

Since the Yale report was released a few years ago, we have come to understand how necessary it is to update the Broadcasting Act and bring it into the 21st century. As progressives and New Democrats, we agreed with the broad strokes of the Yale report. It is so important, because it is a matter of cultural sovereignty. What we need to do is ensure that major new digital broadcasters participate, invest and contribute to the production of original Canadian and Quebec content. That is not what is happening.

It is vital to understand the ecosystem that we have been dealing with and continue to deal with, in the hope that it can change, and why the principle of this bill is so important in the first place. We have a system based on conventional broadcasters and cable companies that contribute to a fund to ensure we can invest in telling our stories on television, in film and other media.

However, big players, new players who are no longer quite so new today, had not contributed at all. It is great to be able to bring them to the table and force them to contribute to the growth and development of Quebec, Canadian and indigenous culture in general, just like conventional broadcasters.

Unfortunately, the bill that was presented to us was botched from the beginning. The NDP was prepared to collaborate. We have always been prepared to collaborate, to make amendments and improvements, to resolve the problems with the bill so that it best meets the needs of the cultural industry and our artists, artisans and technicians. We also want to make sure it best meets the needs of the public, because we need cultural content that brings us together and that we have some control over so that we can tell our stories, which our fellow citizens in Quebec and Canada love to hear. Think of all of the big television, movie and music success stories that we know of.

Unfortunately, we had to deal with very bad communication from the Minister of Canadian Heritage, who on numerous occasions could not for the life of him explain his own bill.

● (2435)

He was attacked under various pretexts by the Conservative Party and was unable to reassure the public and to continue in a constructive and positive direction for this bill.

Obviously, there has been a lot of talk about freedom of expression. It is an important issue, and we are not going to sweep it under the rug and say we do not care about it. As members of the NDP, as New Democrats and progressives, if there were a bill on the table that called into question the freedom of expression of people, of Canadians, we would obviously be very concerned.

Government Orders

The NDP has a strong track record when it comes to protecting freedom of expression and the rights of Canadians. This is not something we take lightly. We did our work in committee, as well as in the media, in the public sphere and in the House, to raise these issues and to take the time needed to get legal opinions, to hear from experts and to get the notices of compliance with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms from the Department of Justice. Those notices actually came twice, before and after the removal of clause 4.1.

We have always been in favour of the principle of the bill. We hope it will pass because our cultural sector will benefit when Internet giants contribute to and help fund the production of original works that tell Canadian and Quebec stories.

We did our work. We were open to arguments because we wanted to be absolutely sure we were protecting freedom of expression. That is what we did, and the NDP is committed to supporting the cultural sector and our artists, artisans and technicians. At the same time, we wanted to be absolutely sure everything was charter compliant and would in no way interfere with individuals' right to keep expressing their opinions and posting whatever videos they wanted on social media. Doing that work was very important, and we did it in a reasonable and responsible way. Unfortunately, there were some closure motions that prevented debate in some cases and violated our rights as parliamentarians.

The way the Liberals have been managing this bill strikes me as rather strange. They imposed closure on a committee, which has only ever happened three times. Despite this gag order, they had to resort to a supermotion. The Liberal government treated this bill as if we had neglected it and taken it lightly, while it was too important for equity in our Canadian programming ecosystem and for the defence of programming and content in French, as well as in indigenous languages.

We want our television, film and musical artists to have the chance to pursue their activities and be properly paid for the work they do, especially musicians on YouTube, and we want them to continue to tell our stories. It is a question of jobs and a very important economic sector. The cultural sector accounts for tens of thousands of jobs across the country.

What is more, culture is what defines us. It says who we are, what our vision of society is, how we approach the issues, social discussions and debates. It also gives us a chance to change our perspective and world view, and a chance to change the world.

I find it sad that on June 21, we still have to talk about this. The Liberals should have managed their agenda better.

However, I think that this bill does ultimately achieve the objectives that matter to our cultural sector, our artists and our artisans. The NDP will always be there to defend them.

• (2440)

[*English*]

Mr. Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, earlier this evening in the debate, the member for Toronto—Danforth, in response to a question I posed, wanted to make it super clear that this bill “specifically excludes content up-

loaded by users.” In response to that, the Canada research chair in Internet and e-commerce law stated on Twitter that it was false, that she was just wrong.

Who has it right? Does the government have it right? Are content users impacted by this bill, as many critics are saying, or is the government right, that they are not? Which way is it?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for this question.

Unfortunately, I believe that we will never have unanimity on this issue. However, I have absolute confidence in the bill before us, in sections 2, 35 and 46 of the Broadcasting Act, the two opinions of the Department of Justice to the effect that the bill is charter compliant, and the fact that the CRTC must also abide by the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. I am absolutely certain that social media users can sleep soundly tonight, tomorrow, the day after tomorrow and next week. These users will not be subject to the regulations adopted together with the new law, but the platforms will be.

[*English*]

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have watched my colleague in meetings with stakeholders. I have watched him in the House. I have watched him in the media, and he really is a friend who is fighting hard for the cultural sector in Canada. The work that he has done to stand up for our artists and our writers and folks who are in the creative sector is outstanding. While I am disappointed by the Conservatives' attempts to derail this legislation, I am not surprised. We know that they have never been friends of the cultural sector. That has been very clear all the way along. I am surprised by how badly the Liberals have managed this.

Could the member speak a little more about what he would have done to make sure this legislation was treated with the urgency and the importance that I know he thinks Bill C-10 has?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Edmonton—Strathcona and I want to reiterate my thanks and congratulations for all the extraordinary work she has done at the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage on this issue that is so important for both Canadians and Quebecers.

Obviously the Liberals fell into some traps, sometimes even traps they set themselves. An NDP government would not have acted in this way to support the cultural sector. We would have communicated the purpose of the bill and our objectives much more effectively.

I also think that we would not have excluded social media at the start only to then withdraw a clause halfway through committee; this monumental mistake by the Liberals and the Minister of Canadian Heritage created a brouhaha, prompted fearmongering and allowed the Conservatives to enter this debate only to engage in scare tactics. Obviously, we would have anticipated these issues and would not have introduced a half-baked or botched bill, like the minister of heritage did.

[English]

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the member's comments specifically about the importance of art and how art is not just something that we enjoy, but is something that can shape our view of the world and our understanding of deeper concepts. Does that not underline the importance of this space being democratized and of limiting government control?

Once we accept that art can be a powerful way of conveying senses, messages and experiences, should that not underline the importance of government not being in a position to shape the kinds of content that people can see over others, and of not being able to intervene and prioritize certain content based on criteria that they establish?

• (2445)

[Translation]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

Arts and culture do indeed shape our views of the world and can influence how people see things or perceive their interactions with others.

However, this bill does not give the government the ability to dictate or impose views. It simply requires that the new digital broadcasters, the web giants, contribute financially to our ecosystem. It is simply a matter of fairness that will benefit the production of cultural content in Quebec and Canada.

[English]

Mr. Paul Manly (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, GP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour and privilege to rise again tonight to speak to Bill C-10. It is always an honour to speak from the unceded traditional territory of the Snuneymuxw First Nation, and to serve the community of Nanaimo—Ladysmith within the traditional territory of the Snaw-naw-as, Snuneymuxw, Stz'uminus and Lyackson First Nations. *Hych'ka Siem*. It is National Aboriginal Peoples Day today, a day to celebrate the rich cultural heritage, the languages, the governance structure and the traditions of the indigenous people of Canada.

I spoke to many organizations about this bill. As an independent party called the Greens, we do not have the same ability to question witnesses in committee, so I held my own meetings and asked my own questions. One of the meetings I had was with APTN and indigenous producers. I want to talk tonight about the importance of indigenous voices in our broadcasting system. If we left this content up to the United States, our views of indigenous people would continue to be the Disneyfied view seen in Pocahontas and spaghetti westerns. It is really important that indigenous voices are heard.

Government Orders

In the early 1990s, my father found a letter written by a woman in 1898 named Elizabeth Shaw. She wrote a scathing 18-page letter about the residential school system and the abuses that were happening at the Port Simpson school. We made a documentary film about her and a number of indigenous people were involved with it.

Afterward, indigenous people told me about some of the other experiences they had and they wanted to make films as well. I said that it was not really for me to tell their story. That is what they should be doing and I helped facilitate it. I worked with a lot of indigenous producers, young people and older people. These people were interested in getting into media production, and I facilitated training and mentorship so they could tell their stories.

What came out of that? I worked with a young guy, Don Claxton. I worked with his sister Dana Claxton as well, who is an indigenous artist, and played music with their sister, Kim Soo Goodtrack. They had an idea for a show. That was in the late 1990s and, lo and behold, APTN, the Aboriginal Peoples Television Network, was born. We produced a pilot for the first preschool show on APTN. I worked with them, a whole bunch of first nations and an indigenous technical crew, who we trained, to create 64 episodes of a show called *Wakanheja*.

The idea behind CanCon is to hear these important indigenous voices. We need to make sure that the independent producers creating Canadian content have access to the Canada Media Fund when they are producing for social media streamers like Netflix and others, rather than just for the Canadian broadcasters, because that is where a lot of this production is going.

I heard a lot of discussion about freedom of expression and that some YouTubers have to go down because Canadian content goes up, that somebody has to go down because somebody is going up. I do not know how many times I heard that at committee during filibusters. A Conservative member gave a great example of somebody they know who does coupon clipping and gives how-tos, and that is great. I looked at the top 100 Canadian YouTube producers and there were people doing nails, gaming commentators and spoof videos. There was lots of content that could be produced anywhere. People knew it was Canadian because they would drop an “eh”, say “get 'er done” or say “about” wrong, but that is not what the idea behind CanCon is all about.

This commercial content drives advertising dollars, and that is what the commercial Internet giants are all about: selling advertising. That is what the algorithms are designed to do. What is important in CanCon is indigenous voices, stories from Canada's north, Canadian documentaries, stories of new Canadians and emerging Canadian musicians. These are the programs that need to be discoverable, and that is what discoverability is about. It is about learning about each other and about Canadian stories, not being inundated by American culture or the dominant culture.

Government Orders

• (2450)

I missed my late show tonight. I want to talk about a Canadian story that needs to be shared and understood. In recent decades, Canadians have learned more and more about our former government's attempt to commit cultural genocide, to commit genocide, to wipe out indigenous cultures through the residential school system. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission has reported extensively and provided a path forward with 94 calls to action.

What most Canadians are unaware of is a parallel set of institutions, the racially segregated Indian hospital system operated by the federal government between the 1940s and 1970s, and those hospitals have their own horror stories. I first heard about the Nanaimo Indian Hospital about 15 years ago, and many people in my community have no idea it ever existed.

In 2013, I was commissioned to produce a film for the Hul'qumi'num Health Hub about cultural safety in the health care system within the Hul'qumi'num speaking areas. Part of that film was to give health professionals an understanding of the history of institutional racism in health care and why indigenous people did not seek help when they needed medical attention.

I interviewed elders who spoke about the trauma they experienced in the Nanaimo Indian Hospital. I heard about painful treatments and I heard about people going into the hospital who were never heard from again. As part of the research for the film, I spoke with researcher Laurie Meijer Drees, who is the co-chair of the First Nations Studies Department at Vancouver Island University. She has documented the oral stories of people who have been in these hospitals, and wrote a book entitled *Healing Histories: Stories from Canada's Indian Hospitals*.

Of course, not all these stories were bad. Some people went to the hospital sick, were given antibiotics and returned home feeling better, but the horrific legacy of the Indian hospitals was based on treating all indigenous people as wards of the state. Consent for medical treatment only came into being for the general public in the 1960s. However, as wards of the state, indigenous people were not asked to consent for their hospitalization or treatment. The system patronizingly viewed them as lacking the capacity to give consent.

An indigenous person could be arrested by the RCMP for not going to the hospital if instructed to do so by a doctor. That twisted, racist mentality facilitated and led to women being sterilized without giving consent and patients being subject to experiments with medication without their prior knowledge.

These hospitals were underfunded and understaffed. Family members and communities were not updated on loved ones in the hospital. People died, children were shipped off to residential school or adopted out and family members were never informed. Some children were taken to hospital and years later no longer knew who they were, what their real names were or where they came from.

Most of what is known about this dark history comes from oral accounts told to researchers and shared through the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, but the medical files are locked and researchers have not been granted permission to access them. Apparently the reason given is that those records contain personal infor-

mation. It is important to protect personal information, however, we do not need to expose personal information to get to the bottom of what happened.

To heal from those past traumas, we need to know the truth. The truth is sealed in those medical records, and it is incumbent upon the government to give researchers and independent adjudicators appropriate clearance, access and analysis of this data to conduct a full independent inquiry. I am looking forward to a first nations producer, an indigenous producer, creating a documentary about this and having members of this place finding this through discoverability on YouTube. These are stories we need to hear. These are the truths we need to hear. We also need to hear about the rich cultural heritage of indigenous people.

Let us talk about censorship. We are worried about censorship. The real concern about censorship is these large corporations. On May 5, red dress day, the National Day of Awareness for Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls, family, friends and loved ones were posting about their missing loved ones. Thousands of those posts disappeared.

Right here in my community, I know Lisa Marie Young went missing years ago. What happened to all these posts? They were all pulled by Instagram. This is happening with other things like Black Lives Matter, Israel and Palestine, Sheikh Jarrah and SOS Colombia. I heard one of the Conservatives say that their posts were missing, right-wing posts, but this is clearly not Conservative posts.

Freedom of speech is important to me and we need to uphold it, and this bill would do that.

• (2455)

Ms. Lenore Zann (Cumberland—Colchester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the arts are such an important part of our woven tapestry here in Canada, including indigenous arts and arts from across the cultures. What is it about this bill that the member actually supports, and why should this bill be passed?

Mr. Paul Manly: Mr. Speaker, I am a huge supporter of the arts, and I have worked in the cultural industries in this country for a long time. I have worked as a professional musician, but I have also worked in artist management, so I know how the MAPL system works: music, artist, performance and lyrics. Two out of four of those, and they have CanCon and they can get that on for radio play.

I understand how the certification works for CRTC. It is a very easy check box: Who is the director? Who is the producer? Who is the writer? Who are the creative key talents on that? They need six out of 10 and they have Canadian content.

Government Orders

It is important that we bring those voices forward and that we support Canadian content, because we have unique stories to tell in this country.

Mr. Damien Kurek (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to both this speech and the previous speech, and specifically the member's impassioned explanation of indigenous history that needs to be told.

My concern is about allowing the state, in this case the CRTC as an agent of the state, to determine what content meets a certain satisfactory requirement to be prioritized in the next-to-play or the algorithm that shows up in someone's feed. If the state, for example, were to try to diminish some of its history, then it would put the very content that the member is so passionately defending at risk of being silenced.

I am just curious as to how the member would reconcile some of the concerns that have been outlined with this bill about the possibility of state intervention, and specifically with the Liberals being able to determine what that may or may not be. How does he reconcile that with the need to ensure that there is actual freedom of expression so that these voices can be heard and, in the example that he shared, that this Canadian history can be told and accessed—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith.

Mr. Paul Manly: Mr. Speaker, the CRTC has not silenced speech in the past. All we need to do is look at Rick Mercer's show. He made fun of politicians and governments freely and had no problem. He was never censored. I find it hilarious to hear the previous Conservative speaker say that he has never read the bill or the act, but he does not trust it because the Liberals put it forward. What they need to know, as Conservatives, is that the 1991 act was created by the Mulroney Conservative government, and it quite clearly states in the act, and this remains in the act:

This Act shall be construed and applied in a manner that is consistent with the freedom of expression and journalistic, creative and programming independence enjoyed by broadcasting undertakings.

That is the language of the Conservative bill that was established in 1991. It remains in this act, and we still have freedom of speech under the Broadcasting Act.

● (2500)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I found that last response from my colleague from Nanaimo—Ladysmith quite satisfying.

What does my colleague think of the fact that cable companies, which are fewer and fewer in number and have fewer and fewer customers, are the only ones contributing to the production of original Canadian content, when giants like Netflix, Crave, Disney+ and YouTube are currently excluded and are not contributing to the production of artistic and cultural content in Canada?

[*English*]

Mr. Paul Manly: Mr. Speaker, it is high time that those other Internet giants all contributed to Canadian content and put money into the Canada Media Fund, and that the Canada Media Fund was opened up. One of my amendments was to have the Canada Media

Fund available to independent producers who are producing for those streaming services, so that somebody making a documentary that is just going to go out on YouTube could actually get Canada Media Fund money to help tell good, Canadian stories.

The Deputy Speaker: It being 1 a.m., pursuant to an order made earlier today, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the third reading stage of the bill now before the House.

[*Translation*]

The question is on the motion.

In the usual way, if a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes to request either a recorded division or that the motion be adopted on division, I invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands.

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a recorded division.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Accordingly, call in the members.

● (2530)

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 174*)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baker
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bendayan	Bennett
Bérubé	Bessette
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Boudrias
Boulerice	Bratina
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe
Cannings	Casey
Chagger	Champoux
Charbonneau	Chen
Cormier	Dabrusin
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Desilets	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duval	Dzerowicz
Easter	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Ellis
Erskine-Smith	Fergus
Fillmore	Finnigan
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser

Government Orders

Freeland	Fry	Albas	Alleslev
Garneau	Garrison	Allison	Arnold
Gaudreau	Gerretsen	Baldinelli	Barlow
Gill	Gould	Barrett	Benzen
Guilbeault	Hajdu	Bergen	Berthold
Hardie	Harris	Bezan	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Holland	Housefather	Block	Brassard
Hughes	Hussen	Calkins	Carrie
Hutchings	Iacono	Chiu	Chong
Ien	Jaczek	Cooper	Cumming
Johns	Joly	Dalton	Dancho
Jones	Jordan	Davidson	d'Entremont
Jowhari	Julian	Diotte	Doherty
Kelloway	Khalid	Dowdall	Dreeschen
Khera	Koutrakis	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Epp
Kusmierczyk	Lalonde	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Lambropoulos	Lametti	Fast	Findlay
Lamoureux	Larouche	Généreux	Genuis
Lattanzio	Lauzon	Gladu	Godin
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier	Gourde	Gray
Lefebvre	Lemire	Hallan	Harder
Lightbound	Long	Hoback	Jansen
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	Jeneroux	Kelly
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacGregor	Kent	Kitchen
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney	Kmiec	Kram
Manly	Marcil	Kurek	Kusie
Martinez Ferrada	Masse	Lake	Lawrence
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)	Lehoux	Liepert
McCrimmon	McDonald	Lloyd	Lukiwski
McGuinty	McKay	MacKenzie	Maguire
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	Martel	Mazier
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	McPherson	McCauley (Edmonton West)	McColeman
Mendès	Mendicino	McLean	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Michaud	Miller	Melillo	Morantz
Monsef	Morrissey	Morrison	Motz
Murray	Ng	Nater	O'Toole
Normandin	O'Connell	Patzner	Paul-Hus
Oliphant	O'Regan	Poillievre	Rayes
Pauzé	Perron	Redekopp	Reid
Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon	Rempel Garner	Richards
Powlowski	Qaqqaq	Rood	Ruff
Qualtrough	Regan	Sahota (Calgary Skyview)	Saroya
Robillard	Rodriguez	Scheer	Schmale
Rogers	Romanado	Shields	Shin
Sahota (Brampton North)	Saini	Shiple	Sloan
Sajjan	Saks	Soroka	Steinley
Samson	Sangha	Strahl	Stubbs
Sarai	Savard-Tremblay	Sweet	Tochor
Scarpaleggia	Schieffe	Uppal	Van Popta
Schulte	Serré	Vecchio	Vidal
Sgro	Shanahan	Viersen	Vis
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Wagantall	Waugh
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard	Webber	Williamson
Simms	Singh	Wilson-Raybould	Wong
Sorbara	Spengemann	Yurdiga	Zimmer— 112
Ste-Marie	Tabbara		
Tassi	Thériault		
Therrien	Trudeau		
Trudel	Turnbull		
Van Bynen	van Koevorden		
Vandal	Vandenbeld		
Vaughan	Vignola		
Weiler	Wilkinson		
Yip	Young		
Zahid	Zann— 196		

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

[English]

The Deputy Speaker: It being 1:30 a.m., pursuant to an order made on Monday, June 21, the House stands adjourned until later this day at 10 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 1:30 a.m.)

NAYS

Members

Abouttaif

Aitchison

CONTENTS

Monday, June 21, 2021

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act

Bill C-206. Third reading	8815
Mr. Drouin	8815
Ms. Normandin	8816
Mr. Green	8817
Mrs. Vecchio	8819
Mr. Genuis	8820
Mr. Albas	8822
Mr. Lawrence	8822
Division on motion deferred	8823

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Budget Implementation Act, 2021, No. 1

Bill C-30. Report stage	8823
Ms. Chabot	8823
Mr. Lamoureux	8824
Mr. Kurek	8825
Mr. Julian	8825
Mr. Kurek	8825
Mrs. Vignola	8826
Mr. Gerretsen	8827
Ms. Kwan	8827
Mr. Julian	8827
Mr. Poilievre	8828
Mr. Trudel	8829
Mr. Genuis	8829
Mr. Viersen	8831
Mr. Lamoureux	8831
Mr. Harris	8831
Mr. Kmiec	8832
Division on Motion No. 2 deferred	8833

Canadian Net-Zero Emissions Accountability Act

Bill C-12—Time Allocation Motion	
Ms. Bibeau (for the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons)	8833
Motion	8833
Mr. Bittle	8833
Mr. Albas	8835
Ms. Pauzé	8836
Mr. Bachrach	8836
Mr. Manly	8836
Mr. Gerretsen	8837
Mr. Albas	8837

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Retirement Congratulations

Mr. Van Bynen	8839
---------------------	------

COVID-19 Vaccines

Mr. Hallan	8840
------------------	------

Withrow Park Farmers' Market

Ms. Dabrusin	8840
--------------------	------

Employment Insurance

Mrs. DeBellefeuille	8840
---------------------------	------

Medal Awarded by MP for Bourassa

Mr. Dubourg	8840
-------------------	------

Barrie—Innisfil

Mr. Brassard	8840
--------------------	------

Housing

Mr. Long	8841
----------------	------

Year of the Garden

Mr. Badawey	8841
-------------------	------

Henry Fleck

Mr. Calkins	8841
-------------------	------

Shop Local

Ms. Bendayan	8841
--------------------	------

Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes

Mr. Barrett	8842
-------------------	------

Attack in London, Ontario

Mr. Carrie	8842
------------------	------

National Indigenous Peoples Day

Ms. Qaqqaq	8842
------------------	------

National Indigenous Peoples Day

Ms. Bérubé	8842
------------------	------

Conservative Party of Canada

Ms. Sahota (Calgary Skyview)	8843
------------------------------------	------

National Indigenous Peoples Day

Ms. Jones	8843
-----------------	------

ORAL QUESTIONS

Ethics

Ms. Bergen	8843
------------------	------

Mr. Rodriguez	8843
---------------------	------

Ms. Bergen	8843
------------------	------

Mr. Rodriguez	8843
---------------------	------

Public Safety

Ms. Bergen	8844
------------------	------

Ms. Hajdu	8844
-----------------	------

Mr. Deltell	8844
-------------------	------

Ms. Hajdu	8844
-----------------	------

Mr. Deltell	8844
-------------------	------

Ms. Hajdu	8844	Mr. Blair	8850
Employment Insurance		Mr. McCauley	8850
Mr. Therrien	8844	Mr. Blair	8850
Ms. Qualtrough	8844	National Defence	
Mr. Therrien	8844	Mr. Fortin	8850
Ms. Qualtrough	8845	Mr. Sajjan	8850
Indigenous Affairs		Mr. Fortin	8850
Ms. Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	8845	Mr. Sajjan	8850
Mr. Miller	8845	International Trade	
Public Safety		Ms. Rood	8851
Ms. Gazan	8845	Ms. Bendayan	8851
Ms. Chagger	8845	Tourism Industry	
Ethics		Mr. Kelly	8851
Mr. Barrett	8845	Ms. Hajdu	8851
Mr. Rodriguez	8845	The Economy	
Mr. Barrett	8845	Ms. Findlay	8851
Mr. Rodriguez	8846	Mr. Fraser	8851
Mr. Barrett	8846	Housing	
Mr. Rodriguez	8846	Ms. Lattanzio	8851
Mr. Berthold	8846	Mr. Hussen	8851
Mr. Rodriguez	8846	Fisheries and Oceans	
Mr. Berthold	8846	Mr. Zimmer	8852
Mr. Rodriguez	8846	Mrs. Jordan	8852
Mr. Berthold	8846	Infrastructure	
Mr. Rodriguez	8847	Mr. Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	8852
Official Languages		Ms. McKenna	8852
Ms. Normandin	8847	Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship	
Ms. Joly	8847	Mr. Hallan	8852
Ms. Normandin	8847	Mr. Mendicino	8852
Ms. Joly	8847	Public Safety	
Ms. Normandin	8847	Ms. Zann	8852
Ms. Joly	8847	Mr. Blair	8852
The Economy		Health	
Mr. Cumming	8847	Mr. Masse	8853
Mr. Fraser	8848	Ms. Hajdu	8853
Mr. Cumming	8848	Canada Revenue Agency	
Mr. Fraser	8848	Ms. Ratansi	8853
Mr. Cumming	8848	Mr. Sorbara	8853
Mr. Fraser	8848	Residential Schools	
Government Programs		Mr. Blanchet	8853
Mr. Boulerice	8848	Motion	8854
Ms. Qualtrough	8848	(Motion agreed to)	8854
Mr. Blaikie	8849	House of Commons	
Ms. Qualtrough	8849	President of the Public Health Agency of Canada	
Indigenous Affairs		The Speaker	8855
Mr. Battiste	8849	Points of Order	
Mr. Lametti	8849	Documents Related to the Transfer of Ebola and Henipah Viruses to the Wuhan Institute of Virology	
Public Safety		Mr. Rodriguez	8855
Ms. Alleslev	8849	Mr. Deltell	8855
Mr. Blair	8849		
Mr. Motz	8849		
Mr. Blair	8850		
Mr. Paul-Hus	8850		

Questions Passed as Orders for Returns

Mr. Lamoureux 8877

GOVERNMENT ORDERS**Criminal Code**

Bill C-6. Third reading 8877
 Mr. Viersen 8878
 Ms. Rood 8878
 Mr. Lamoureux 8878
 Ms. Gaudreau 8878
 Mr. Lloyd 8878
 Mr. Sloan 8880
 Mr. Boulerice 8880
 Mr. Lamoureux 8880

Message from the Senate

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes) 8881

Criminal Code

Bill C-6. Third reading 8881
 Mr. Kurek 8881
 Mrs. Wagantall 8882
 Ms. Gazan 8882
 Mr. Gerretsen 8883
 Mr. Sloan 8883
 Mr. Viersen 8884
 Mrs. Wagantall 8885
 Mr. Gerretsen 8885
 Division on motion deferred 8885

Broadcasting Act**Motion That Debate Be Not Further Adjourned**

Mrs. Fortier 8885
 Motion 8885
 Mr. Deltell 8885
 Mr. Guilbeault 8886
 Mr. Therrien 8886
 Mr. Boulerice 8886
 Mr. Manly 8886
 Ms. Dabrusin 8887
 Mr. Rayes 8887
 Ms. McPherson 8887
 Mr. Gerretsen 8888
 Mr. Viersen 8888
 Mr. Diotte 8888
 Mr. Louis 8888
 Mr. Manly 8889
 Mr. Kurek 8889
 Mr. Zimmer 8889
 Ms. McPherson 8890
 Motion agreed to 8891

Bill C-10—Time Allocation Motion

Motion 8891
 Amendment negatived 8892
 Motion agreed to 8894

ROYAL ASSENT

The Speaker 8894

GOVERNMENT ORDERS**Canadian Net-Zero Emissions Accountability Act****Notice of Closure Motion**

Mrs. Fortier 8894

Broadcasting Act

Bill C-10. Report stage 8894

Speaker's Ruling

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès) 8894

Motions in Amendment

Mr. Rayes 8894
 Motion Nos. 1 to 3 8894
 Mr. Guilbeault 8895
 Motion No. 4 8895
 Mr. Manly 8895
 Motion No. 5 8895
 Mr. Guilbeault 8895
 Motion No. 6 8895
 Mr. Manly 8895
 Motion No. 7 8895
 Ms. McPherson 8895
 Motion No. 8 8895
 Mr. Rayes 8895
 Motion No. 9 8895
 Mr. Guilbeault 8895
 Motion No. 10 8895
 Mr. Rayes 8895
 Motion No. 11 8895
 Mr. Guilbeault 8895
 Motion No. 12 8895
 Ms. McPherson 8895
 Motion No. 13 8895
 Mr. Guilbeault 8896
 Motion No. 14 8896
 Mr. Manly 8896
 Motion No. 15 8896
 Mr. Guilbeault 8896
 Motions Nos. 16 and 17 8896
 Mr. Champoux 8896
 Motion No. 18 8896
 Mr. Manly 8896
 Motion No. 19 8896
 Mr. Guilbeault 8896
 Motions Nos. 20 and 21 8896
 Mr. Champoux 8896
 Motion No. 22 8896
 Mr. Manly 8896
 Motion No. 23 8896
 Mr. Rayes 8896
 Ms. McPherson 8898
 Mrs. McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo) 8898
 Mr. Kurek 8898

Mr. Lamoureux	8899	Motion agreed to	8918
Mrs. McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	8900	Bill C-10. Third reading	8918
Mr. Boulerice	8900	Ms. Dabrusin	8919
Mr. Zimmer	8900	Mr. Kurek	8920
Mr. Manly	8900	Mr. Boulerice	8920
Ms. McPherson	8902	Mr. Vis	8921
Ms. Shin	8902	Mr. Diotte	8921
Division on Motion No. 1 deferred	8903	Ms. Zann	8922
Division on Motion No. 2 deferred	8903	Ms. McPherson	8922
Division on Motion No. 4 deferred	8903	Mr. Champoux	8923
Division on Motion No. 5 deferred	8903	Mr. Champoux	8923
Division on Motion No. 13 deferred	8903	Mr. Genuis	8924
Division on Motion No. 18 deferred	8903	Mr. Louis	8924
Division on Motion No. 22 deferred	8903	Mr. Boulerice	8925
Motion No. 1 negatived	8905	Mr. Boulerice	8925
Motion No. 2 negatived	8906	Mr. Vis	8926
Motion No. 10 agreed to	8908	Ms. McPherson	8926
Motion No. 4 agreed to	8909	Mr. Genuis	8927
Motion No. 5 negatived	8911	Mr. Manly	8927
Motion No. 8 negatived	8912	Ms. Zann	8928
Motion No. 13 negatived	8914	Mr. Kurek	8929
Motion No. 18 agreed to	8915	Mr. Boulerice	8929
Motion No. 22 agreed to	8917	Motion agreed to	8930
Bill C-10. Report stage	8917	(Bill read the third time and passed)	8930

Published under the authority of the Speaker of
the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the Copyright Act. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the Copyright Act.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: <https://www.ourcommons.ca>

Publié en conformité de l'autorité
du Président de la Chambre des communes

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la Loi sur le droit d'auteur. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre des communes.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la Loi sur le droit d'auteur.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante :
<https://www.noscommunes.ca>